
9 999999 034498

VOICES OF INDIAN FREEDOM MOVEMENT

(VOICE OF EXTREMIST AND MILITANT NATIONALISM)

VOLUME III

(Book 1)

Edited and Annotated by

J.C. JOHARI

M.A., LL.B., Ph.D.

AKASHDEEP PUBLISHING HOUSE

New Delhi (India)

1993

AKASHDEEP PUBLISHING HOUSE
4374/4B, Ansari Road
Daryaganj, New Delhi-110 002

PRINTED IN INDIA

Published by Akashdeep Publishing House, New Delhi-110002
and Printed at J.R. Printers, Delhi.

PREFACE

Indian freedom movement crossed the age of adolescence in the wake of the present century. The trend of 'sane and loyal nationalism', as conceived by A.O. Hume, the 'Father of the Indian National Congress', witnessed its replacement by the trend of liberal and critical nationalism. The misdeeds of the British colonial rulers culminating in the partition of Bengal in 1905 forced the nationalist leaders to revise their line of thought and action. However, it had its different reactions on the people of different nature and temperament. While those faithfully subscribing to the line of Hume still preferred to act with restraint and caution in denouncing the black deeds of the white bureaucracy, others sharpened the vigour of their fiery patriotism by invoking the message of Swami Vivekanand to 'be bold' and what they openly said and did, signified the trend of extremism and militant nationalism in the country. Thus, while the former declared 'reforms, no revolution', the latter raised the slogans of 'Swaraj and Swadeshi' and frankly advocated the methods of forceful demonstrations and violent agitations. For this reason, while the former came to be known as the 'moderates', the latter were called 'extremists' and 'militants'.

A proper study of the subject of India's freedom movement covers all what prominent Indian figures thought and did for the great cause ; it also covers important reactions, interpretations and pronouncements of the British leaders and 'observers'. As such, I have put the matter in two parts While Part I contains original writings and statements of the great Indian figures, Part II has important readings representing the British point of view. The noteworthy point is that our national leaders spoke in different 'voices' and so I have sought to include their views in different volumes with a view to maintain, as far as possible, the unity of a particular trend. In this volume I have taken up the views of the great Indian leaders like Swami Vivekanand, Sri Aurobindo, Lala Lajpat Rai, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Bipin Chandra Pal, Lala Har Dayal and Sardar Bhagat Singh. In very harsh terms the extremist

leaders denounced British rule and also condemned the 'moderate' leaders as 'prayer-makers', 'petition-mongers,' 'mendicants with a begging bowl policy' and 'Unpaid Parliamentary Opposition to His Majesty's Government in India'. Swami Vivekanard spoke like a Saint of Hinduism and his ideas gave inspiration to the extremist leaders who sought to 'Indianise' the freedom movement. Aurobindo Ghose, once a diehard extremist, retired from politics after 1910, and yet the writings of this mystic of Hindu philosophy continued to inspire the nationalist leaders belonging to the trend of extremist and militant nationalism.

It should, however, be borne in mind that the extremist leaders did not follow the path of terrorism. Moreover, with their growing age and experience they became constitutionalists in the end. Lala Har Dayal, who was a rank terrorist in the pre-World War I period, became a constitutionalist after the defeat of Germany and Turkey in the War and he advocated the case of imperial federation. Different is the case of Sardar Bhagat Singh who took to the path of terrorism and paid with his life for the great cause of country's liberation. He and his comrades (Sukhdev and Rajguru) became martyrs. I could have included some more leaders in this volume which could not be possible owing to the limitation of space. For this I crave the indulgence of the readers. I, however, hope that my scheme would receive the appreciation of the readers who would find here much for the purpose of their advanced study or research in this important field of modern Indian history and politics.

I have drawn material from numerous published sources, Indian and foreign, according to my own scheme and I offer my sincere gratitude to all of them. I am thankful to a large number of my friends for the help they extended to me for the completion of this project. I am much thankful to Seema Saxena and Seema Johari who helped me in the collection and arrangement of the matter and checking of proofs. In particular, I am grateful to my Publishers who appreciated this project and took pains to bring out the volumes in a record time.

—J.C. Johari

INTRODUCTION

New developments took place in the wake of the present century. The opening decade looked like a critical period in the history of India in view of the fact that while, the people "were showing increasing signs of self-consciousness, the retrograde policy of Government could not but make itself more and more assertive and even more naked."[1] The new generation of Congress leaders took a different view of things. They were no longer prepared to tolerate the state of exploitation and injustice perpetrated by the colonial masters, nor did they feel satisfied with the ways of prayer-making and petition-mongering. In stead they condemned the British misrule and preferred the ways of resistance and agitation. They took inspiration from India's glorious past and cried for Swaraj and Swadeshi. The new leaders, called 'extremists', differed from their older and elder comrades, called 'moderates', and they sought to give a new direction to the course of freedom struggle.

Vivekanand was a saint, but in his saintly affirmations we find much that imparted new dimensions to the philosophy and practice of Indian nationalism. His stress on spiritual revivalism and idealism provided contents of socialism and universalism to the case of Indian nationalism. His emphasis on strength and fearlessness gave inspiration to the path of resistance and agitation. His advocacy of the cause of the poor and down-trodden people exhorted the nationalist leaders to think of country's freedom in terms of the social and economic emancipation of the masses. Though a Hindu ascetic, he thought in terms of welfare of the people belonging to all faiths and creeds and he redefined religion as a way of good life ensuring the dignity of the people and their nation. On

1. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya : *The History of the Indian National Congress*, Vol. I, p. 68.

one occasion he said : "We as a nation have lost our individuality ; and that is the cause of all mischief of India. We have to give back to the nation its lost individuality, and raise the masses. The Hindu, the Mohammedan, the Christian, all have trampled them under foot."[2] It is obvious that Vivekanand "upheld that a strong and lasting nationalism could be built in India only on a religious basis. But he cannot be charged with sectarianism or communalism. Religion signified to him the eternal principles of moral and spiritual advancement. He had the bold vision to foresee that a mechanical nationalism with the apportionment of spoils cannot be lasting."[3]

Apart from giving a metaphysical interpretation of Indian nationalism, Vivekanand suggested a new line that had its definite impact on swadeshi and boycott movement launched by the 'extremist' leaders. He gave the cult of 'Indianness' which signified that the people of India should not blindly imitate the ways of the West, instead they should be the leaders of the world by their spiritual force. Progressively he grew more international in outlook when he said : "Even in politics and sociology, problems that were only national twenty years ago, can no longer be solved on national grounds only. They are assuming huge proportions, gigantic shapes. They can only be solved when looked at in the broader light of international grounds."[4] He advised the people to be modern without cutting off their roots from the past. As Nehru observes : "Rooted in the past and in full pride of India's heritage, Vivekanand was yet modern in his approach in life and problems and was a kind of bridge between the past of India and her present."[5]

Once a great revolutionary figure and after 1910 a prominent mystic of Hindu philosophy, Aurobindo Ghose's name is associated with the extremist-anarchist school of Indian nationalism. He had his association with secret organisations of Bengal which believed in the cult of violence and armed

2. *Life of Swami Vivekanand*, Vol. I, pp. 306-07.
3. V.P. Varma : *Modern Indian Political Thought*, p. 121.
4. See Jawaharlal Nehru : *The Discovery of India*, p. 358.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 356.

insurrection. He took inspiration from Hindu mythological gospels and sought to organise the people in the name of the Bhawani, the Shakti, the Mother. He condemned the ways of the 'moderate' leaders by calling them 'Pherozeshahi'[6] and suggested the methods of passive resistance and agitation which certainly involved the elements of violence and force. He justified the use of the technique of 'boycott' on moral as well as practical grounds. But what he said after his retirement from active politics and his life as a saint in his *ashram* at Pondicherry shows his espousal of a new kind of nationalism allowing no place for extremism, anarchy and violence.[7] It is an ideal form of nationalism having its natural confluence with universalism and humanism.[8] Prof. Varma, therefore, holds that Aurobindo's creed of nationalism "was not narrow and fanatical but had a cosmopolitan character."[9]

The leaders belonging to the 'extremist school' of Indian nationalism certainly brought about a basic change in the course of our freedom movement. Among them Tilak's name

6. Sir Pherozeshah Mehta was a leading light of 'sane and loyal nationalism' and a prominent figure of the 'moderate school' of Indian national movement. 'Pherozeshahi' refers to this tradition.

7. What an English journalist, Valentine Chirol, says about Aurobindo may be applicable to the early phase of his political career : "With the gospel of active self-sacrifice none can assuredly quarrel...... For him British rule and Western civilisation, for which it stands, threaten the very life of Hinduism." *Indian Unrest*, p. 90. So Lord Curzon records his impression in these words : "Aurobindo Ghose, whose fervid writings are steeped in idealism, and who did more than anyone to breathe into the sinister spectre of anarchy the vitalising influence of religion." Earl of Ronaldshay : *The Heart of Aryavarta*, p. 128.

8. An English writer, J. Ramsay MacDonald could correctly grasp the mission of Aurobindo when he observed : "Aurobindo Ghose has made the connection between his devout Hinduism and his strenuous nationalism clear. Man has to fulfil God, he has written, and that is only possible for fulfilling himself, this again being possible only through nationality. On this religious conception rests his belief in Swadeshi and his desire to see the English predominance in India ended." *The Awakening of India*, p. 182.

9. Varma, *op. cit.*, p. 307.

leads all the rest who took the view that since the Indian Government was created by the statutes of the Parliament of Great Britain and was not responsible to the people of India, the idea of bringing about constitutional changes through the action of constituted authorities was unthinkable."[10] But the mission of the Lokmanya (Leader Honoured by the People) was misunderstood by his Indian friends and English foes. He precursed much what the great nationalist leaders uttered after his death in 1920. He took inspiration from Hindu scriptures and organised Shivaji and Ganapati festivals to mobilise the people for the national cause. But it would be a sheer mistake to dub him as a Hindu revivalist.

Though a Hindu by religion and a Chitpavan Brahmin by caste, Tilak was a man of secular orientation and it was, by and large, due to his influence that the Congress leaders agreed to accept the terms of the Hindu-Muslim Concordat signed at Lucknow in 1916. He frankly admired the philosophy of British liberalism and fought for the preservation of the freedom of press and prevalence of 'rule of law' in the country. In 1892 he congratulated the people of Central Finsbury for electing Dadabahi Naoroji to their Parliament and in 1901, on the occasion of the death of Queen Victoria as the Empress of India, he admired her reign for bestowing on us peace and progress. But what changed his mind was the misrule of Viceroy Curzon culminating in the partition of Bengal in 1905. He was

---

10. A. Appadorai: *Indian Political Thinking in the Twentieth Century from Noroji to Nehru*, p. 29. So says Prof. M.R. Palande: "The most dominating personality which ultimately influenced and cautioned national thought and activity for a quarter of a century prior to 1920 was undoubtedly Lokmanya Tilak. Endowed with a robust mind which was remarkably enriched by all the disciplines and profundities of liberal education and with a keen sensibility of intellectual and emotional perception, it is no wonder that Tilak not only carried on the mission of his great predecessors but actually gave to it a new dimension of popular awakening and enthusiasm which immediately added to its magnitude and earned for him the distinction of being recognised as the father of the Indian unrest by such a hostile critic as Sir Valentine Chirol." Refer to his 'Introduction" in *Source Material for a History of Freedom Movement in India*, Bombay Government Publication, 1957, Vol. II, p. iii.

arrested on the charge of writing rebellious notes in his papers published from Poona During the course of his trial he invoked the principles of British jurisprudence. He was sentenced for six years imprisonment on the charge of sedition and sent to Mandalay in Burma. But after his release from the jail and return to India in 191+ he strongly supported the Home Rule Movement of Mrs. Annie Besant and thus became, by all means, an advocate of constitutional struggle for freedom. He did not appreciate the saintly ways of Mahatma Gandhi and his thesis of non-co-operation. In stead he advanced his idea of 'responsive co-operation' implying co-operation to the British Raj on certain well-spelt and well-responded conditions.[11] It is obvious that Tilak's conception of Indian nationalism "was an amalgam of diverse strands of thought ; pride in the legacy of ancient India ; appreciation of the rule of British rule in bringing about political and administrative unification of the country ; appreciation of Western learning and science ; recognition of economic exploitation by foreign rulers ; and the recognition of the need to form a national political movement of the people across the barriers of race, caste, religion and sex."[12]

All revolutionary ideas and actions, in their beginning, are misunderstood and misinterpreted by the friends and foes alike. So happened with Tilak who sought to revolutionise the line of his predecessors without cutting it off from its foundations. Prof. M.R. Palande, therefore, makes a fine observation when he says : "No Indian leader has probably been subjected to such merciless persecution and reckless misrepresentation and maligning by ruling and retired Anglo-Indian bureaucrats and by British publicists as was this great patriot whose knowledge, insight and experience led him straight to the fundamentals of things and who vigorously exposed the insidious but fatal poison of imperialistic hypocrisy. Tilak was the *bete noire par*

11. The idea of 'responsive cooperation' originated with Tilak at the time of Amritsar Congress in 1919. It meant nothing more than opposition when necessary, and cooperation when possible. D.P. Karmarkar : *Bal Gangadhar Tilak : A Study*, p. 280.

12. N.R. Inamdar : "The Political Ideas of Lokmanya Tilak" in Thomas Pantham and K.L. Deutsch) (ed. s) : *Political Thought in Modern India*, p. 115.

excellence of British imperialism at a time when it was still on the crescendo of prosperity and power. And his most valuable service lay in inspiring an atmosphere of national revolt and resistance against the emasculation imposed by the imperialism indeed against its very existence. The slogan 'swaraj is my birth-right and I will have it', in fact, embodies the eternal truth that slavery is unnatural and, as such, if for no other reason, must be ended. With this background, the Mahatma found the nation sufficiently responsive when he gave the great call for non-cooperation on the day of Tilak's death."[13]

Though the first figure of the trinity of Lal, Bal, Pal[14]—the three great leaders of the extremist school—Lala Lajpat Rai's position "was somewhat between the Moderates and the Extremists."[15] As a revolutionary, his tone was manifestly hard and as an Arya Samajist his reaction to anti-Hindu postures was markedly sharp But by all means, he was a staunch nationalist believing in Hindu-Muslim unity and an active Congressman subscribing to the way of secular and constructive nationalism. Thus, he wrote sharp rejoinders to what Sir Syed Ahmed Khan had given in his books and articles and also in his occasional letters to the editors of leading newspapers. He sought to broaden the base of the freedom movement by involving masses and for this he admired the leadership of Gandhiji. His socialistic approach is evident from the fact that during his stay in America (1914-1919) he founded Indian Labourers Association there and thereafter on coming back to India he founded the Servants of People Society in 1920 He sought to play the role of a mediator between the camps of Gokhale and Tilak at the Kashi Congress (1905), though he sided with the latter on account of his adherence to his (Tilak's) extremist orientation.[16]

Lalaji looked at British imperialism mainly as an economic venture and, for this reason, desired to beat it down with the

---

13. Palande, *op. cit* , pp. iv-v.

14. Lal for Lala Lajpat Rai, Bal for Bal Gangadhar Tilak, and Pal for Bipin Chandra Pal.

15. Varma, *op. cit.*, p. 304 n 4.

16. In 1920 after the death of Tilak, Lalaji set up the Tilak School of Politics in the memory of the great leader.

weapons of 'boycott' of foreign goods and in stead use of 'home-made' (swadeshi) articles so as to prevent the flow of Indian money to England through commercial channels. As he said : "The logic of losing business is more likely to impress this nation of shopkeepers than any argument based on the ethics of justice." In his speech at the All-India Swadeshi Conference held at Surat in 1907, he said : "The spirit of Swadeshi ought to prevail in all departments of life subject to the one condition that whatever they had to learn from the West in order to maintain progress and secure prosperity, they need not be ashamed to learn."

Lalaji appreciated Gandhiji's idea of non-violent non-cooperation with reservations. He did not endorse it fully ; nor did he appreciate the 'walk-in, walk-out' strategy of the Swarajists. He, of course, admired Gandhiji's idea of mass movement and (with Madan Mohan Malaviya) formed the Nationalist Party that had some workable adjustment with the Swarajists in the Central Legislative Assembly. Thus, in some way, he subscribed to the way of 'responsive cooperation'.[17] In very harsh term he criticised the provisions of the Rowlatt Act and denounced the role of bureaucracy in the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy of 1919. Above all, though a constitutionalist by virtue of being a fighter for India's freedom inside the Central Legislative Assembly, he warned the British rulers that although India had adopted the path of peaceful and non-violent struggle for the achievement of swaraj, it was possible that in a mood of paroxym of rage, Indian young men might adopt the techniques of violence and terrorism against the brutalities of the government."[18]

Bipin Chandra Pal occupies the last place in the trinity of the great 'extremist' leaders. Like Aurobindo, he offered a metaphysical interpretation of Indian nationalism by

17. It is evident from Malaviyaji's argument of "taking the job when you have the chance and making the best out of it. In practical terms, it meant taking the last juice out of the Government of India Act of 1919 " See Lal Bahadur : *Indian Freedom Movement and Thought : Politics of 'Pro-Change' Versus 'No-Change', 1919–1929*, p. 420, Appendix III.

18. Varma, *op. cit.*, p. 291.

preaching an organic conception of national unity as the basis of vigorous and fiery patriotism. In one of his writings titled 'New India' he presented this case thus : "The New India is neither Hindu,—though the Hindu unquestionably forms the original stock and staple of it ; nor Mohammedan,—though they have made many material countributions to it,—nor even British,—though they are politically the masters of the country now,—but is made up of the varied and valuable materials supplied in successive stages of its evolution, by the three great world civilisations, which the three great sections of the present Indian community represent." He not only desired such a model of composite patriotism, but also contemplated in terms of an ideal rule what he termed 'divine democracy'. As he said : "The ideal of swaraj that has revealed itself to us is the ideal of divine democracy...Men are gods, and the equality of divine possibilities and the divine destiny of every individual, be he a Hindu, or a Muslim, a Buddhist or a Christian."[19]

Like Lalaji and Lokmanya, Pal subscribed to the ways of extremist movement in the early phase of his political career. He rabidly rejected the way of prayer-making and petition-mongering as advocated by the 'moderates' and in stead force-fully advocated the use of the techniques of an assertive and aggressive nationalism in which people were exhorted to reject Western institutions. He played his part in the swadeshi and boycott movement "implicit in which was the underlying rejection of Western values and ideals."[20] As he said : "We loved the abstraction we call India, but we hated the things that it actually was. Our patriotism was not composed of our love for our own history, literature, arts, industries, culture and institutions, but as a prototype of England which we wished her to be. The new spirit cured us of an imaginary and abstract patriotism. Love of India means love for its rivers and mountains, for its paddy fields and its arid sandy lands, its

19. B.C. Pal : *Life and Utterances*, pp. 95-96.

20. Daniel Argov : *Moderates and Extremists in Indian Nationalist Movement*, p. 122.

towns and villages and poor people, for its languages, literature, philosoophies, religion, culture and civilisation."[21]

Undeniable is the fact that Tilak "provided theory and strategy for India's revolution."[22] But he never thought in terms of, what Jawaharlal Nehru termed, 'purna swaraj' (complete independence) and the Lahore Congress took finally a solemn resolve in its favour in 1929. He identified swaraj with 'home rule' for India as conceived by Mrs. Besant and Jinnah and the English rulers unwisely and impatiently became allergic to it.[23] After his return from Burma he wrote as well as uttered that "the duty of every Indian, be he great or small, rich or poor, is to support and assist His Majesty's Government to the best of the ability.'[24] Lala Lajpat Rai hovered between the poles of moderatism and extremism, though more to the side of the latter. In the end, Pal also became a constitutionalist by supporting the path of 'responsive cooperation' and the idea of establishment of an imperial federation. As a matter of fact, no extremist leader belonging to the trinity of Lal, Bal, Pal ever conceived or spoke in terms of India's complete severance from British Empire by means of a violent revolution. Moreover, with the gaining of more experience and the advancement of age, they veered round to the path of constitutional struggle to achieve swaraj for India as a part of the British Empire.

Peculiar is the case of Lala Har Dayal who, once known for being an advocate of terrorism, became a constitutionalist after the first World War. It is said that his tremendous energies "found an appropriate outlet in the activities of the Ghadar Party" of which he became the Secretary with Baba Sohan Singh as its president.[25] The very first issue of the

---

21. *Ibid.*, pp. 122-123.

22. Stanley Wolpert : *Tilak and Gokhale : Revolution and Reform in the Making of Modern India*, p. 106.

23. T.L. Shay : *The Legacy of Lokmanya*, p. 130.

24. See N.R. Ray : "Introduction" in B.N. Pande (ed.) : *A Centenary History of the Indian National Congress, 1885-1985*, Vol. I, p. 69.

25. Santimay Ray : "National Revolutionary Movements in India, 1900—1918", *Ibid.*, pp. 371-72. The Ghadar Party was formed in 1913 in the city of San Francisco in the State of California in USA.

Hindustan Ghadar (dated 1 March, 1913) declared : 'Today there begins in a foreign land but in our country's tongue a war against the British Raj. What is your name ? Mutiny. Where will it break out ? India. When will the time come ? When rifle and blood will take the place of pen and ink." The Ghadar Party adopted a constitution in which the course of armed revolt was specifically advocated for the achievement of the aim of swaraj. It became obvious that the leaders of this movement had taken inspiration from the great mutiny (Ghadar) of 1857 and they "were firm believers in using violence as any negotiations to attain the desired goal was considered a weakness".[26] Benjamin Harris Sloan, who was associated with the Ghadar Party, called Har Dayal "an out and out anarchist of the confiscate-everything and cut anybody's throat type."[27]

A profound change took place in the life of this revolutionary leader after the first World War when he frankly denounced German imperialism and endorsed the case of India's self-rule within the Empire. It was certainly astounding if we compare it with his utterances of the War-time when he had unreservedly declared that the "world understands only the law of the mailed fist." Now his praise for British Empire was so effusive that the India Office in London saw to it that his book *Forty-four Months in Germany and Turkey* was translated into Hindi and distributed free of charge in India.[28] This change may be due to two reasons. First, as Lala Lajpat Rai said, "Har Dayal always kept himself in the background and avoided danger."[29] Second, as M.N. Roy feels, it was a proof

---

Many leading Indian figures like Taraknath Das, Bhai Parmanand, Ram Nath Puri and Sant Teja Singh were associated with it. For some time Lala Lajpat Rai also had some connection with this party.

26. J.S. Bains : "The Ghadar Movement : A Golden Chapter of Indian Nationalism" in *Indian Journal of Political Science* (Jan.—March, 1962), p. 48.

27. E.C. Brown : *Har Dayal : Hindu Revolutionary and Rationalist*, p. 209.

28. Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 225.

29. Lala Lajpat Rai, *Young India*, p. 176.

of Har Dayal's inconsistency or political instability or want of sober judgment informed by experience.[30] This change from a frankly pro-German to a distinctly anti-German stance made him an object of ridicule and so Lala Lajpat Rai scoffed at him, though he found consolation in the fact that, in spite of being a constitutionalist, this firebrand revolutionary had hatred of British rule in India.[31]

While Lalaji, Tilak and Pal belong to the school of extremism and Har Dayal shifts from the school of terrorism to that of moderatism, the name of Sardar Bhagat Singh is associated with the school of militant extremism or terrorism. Those who happily or willy-nilly tolerate the state of injustice and seek to remedy it by soft or peaceful means are called 'moderates'; those who donot tolerate the state of injustice and desire to correct the situation by hard and forceful means are called 'extremists'; but those who openly advocate the path of violence and invariably seek to operate in a clandestine manner are called 'miltants' and 'terrorists'. One may take note of the fact that while the stances of the 'moderates' and the 'terrorists' are quite unambiguous, the case of the 'extremists' is vague and vacillating in as much as they may lean to either side and change their views or stances according to the exigencies of the situation or with the growth of their age and experience. We have seen that Lalaji, Tilak and Pal softened their stances and thereby blurred the line of distinction between the 'moderate' and the 'extremist' schools of Indian nationalist movement.

But the names of Sardar Bhagat Singh and his comrades find place in the galaxy of those who served the country with their blood. It was a consequence of their fiery patriotism coupled with their impatient and irresistible zeal to liberate the motherland from the clutches of the alien rulers. These leaders were also inspired by the ideals of social justice and so they looked towards the freedom of the country as the *sine qua non* for improving the lot of the poor and downtrodden masses. But

30. See M.N. Roy (and Abani Mukerji) : *India in Transition.*
31. Dharamvira : *Har Dayal*, p. 289.

this line of action failed to prevail in the face of strong British administration and also owing to its non-avowal by the leaders of the country who sought to prosecute freedom struggle in an open and non-violent manner.

A study of the ideas and role of prominent extremist and militant nationalist leaders in India's freedom movement leaves some strong impressions. First, the trend of moderatism continued in spite of the fact that it was shaken and modified to the practicable extent by the trend of extremism. The extremist leaders also softened their stances in course of time in response to their growing age and experience. Second, the rise of the trend of extremism occurred owing to British misrule having its highest mark in the partition of Bengal. The nationalist leaders reacted against it in their own ways which drew the line of distinction between the 'moderates' and the 'extremists'. Those who differed from the ways of the earlier leaders ('moderates') were attracted to the ways of force and agitation on account of the repressive measures of the Raj against which they found no other suitable remedy. Third, the revolutionary leaders took inspiration from Hindu mythological traditions, precepts and convictions just for the sake of mobilising the people against the tyrannical rule. They invoked Hindu mythological traditions as an instrument of popular appeal and attraction to create new consciousness among the people as well to effect their social regeneration. The English writers deliberately misconstrued it as the revival of Hinduism leading to the Hinduisation of the Indian nationalist movement. Unfortunately such a propaganda had its effect on the leaders of Muslim communalism who did not bother to understand the commitment of the great extremist and militant leaders to the cause of secularism and social justice.[32]

As a matter of fact, Indian nationalism saw its second birth in 1905 in the form of the emergence of new leaders, with new

32. As a noted Pakistani historian (S.U. Pirzada) asserts : "One may easily read clear indications of these dreams in the rise and growth of Hindu nationalism, ...the intentions of the Hindu leaders and their ultimate goal." *Foundations of Pakistan*, Vol. II, p. xii.

beliefs, and new methods of action.[33] The schism between the camps of the older and elder leaders on the one side and the new and the younger leaders, on the other, became inevitable and it did occur at the Surat Congress in 1907. The wound could be healed after about a decade when, as a result of the efforts of Mrs. Annie Besant, the prominent extremist leaders rejoined the national organisation. But the Surat split had its constructive aspect as well. The earlier line of blind loyalty to the Raj saw its replacement by the new line of critical and assertive nationalism. A split is a definite result of clash between the contending forces and so it leaves its positive results regardless of the victory or defeat of either party. Keeping it (and also other events of split of the later period), an eminent Indian historian well observes: "A review of Congress history shows that whenever there was a split, the Congress came out stronger, the forces of progress getting the better of their opponents."[34]

The criticism of the extremist leaders about the ideas and methods of the 'moderates' was not without any foundation at all, though we may not fully endorse the view of Lala Lajpat Rai that their movement "lacked the essentials of a national movement."[35] We may, however, find sense in these words of Lalaji: "A movement does not become national by the mere desire of its founders to make it so. In the opinion of the writer it is a mistake to start *a national political movement* unless those who start it are prepared to make great sacrifices for it. A halting, half-hearted political movement depending on the sympathy and goodwill of the very class against whom it is directed, consulting their wishes at every step, with its founders or leaders trembling for their safety and keeping their purse-strings right, only doing as much as the authorities

33. To the British, such a trend was apprehensive. As Ratcliffe observes: "The Congress of 1904 was the culminating point of the movement as directed by the founders, and by those younger leaders who shared their political faith and were content with their methods. Thereafter, new and disturbing forces made themselves felt." *Sir William Wedderburn*, pp. 138-39.

34. N.R. Ray, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

35. Lala Lajpat Rai, *op. cit.*, 125.

would allow and as would not interfere in any way with their own personal interests and comforts and incomes, is from its very nature detrimental to real national interests. A political movement is mischievous in its effects if its leaders donot put a sufficient amount of earnestness into it to evoke great enthusiasm among their followers, such as would prepare them for great sacrifices for the cause on the one hand, and, on the other, produce a certain amount of fear and unpleasant consequences in those against whom it is directed."[36]

But the movement of the extremist and militant leaders was criticised for taking inspiration from religious revivalism and antiquated creeds. Valentine Chirol termed it "a Brahmanical reaction against the West."[37] While writing his memoirs, Nehru commented that "socially speaking, the revival of Indian nationalism in 1907 was definitely reactionary."[38] So a Marxist historian of India points out that this trend "not only inevitably weakened the advance of the political consciousness and clarity of the movement (nearly all the best-known leaders of the Extremism moved later in varying degrees of cooperation with imperialism, or to speculative abstraction from politics, and found themselves out of sympathy with the subsequent advance of movement), but also divided the advancing forces."[39] However, such critical observations should not be accepted without some reservation. The contribution of the extremist and militant nationalists has its own place in the history of Indian freedom struggle that cannot be so easily undermined or dismissed by the holders of a pro-colonial or a so-called progressive orientation. These leaders certainly contributed to the flow of the stream of Indian nationalism that signified "a determination, based upon an assertion of the superiority of things Indian over things foreign, to safeguard the cultural heritage of India from the inroads of the dynamic civilisation of the West."[40]

—J.C. Johari

---

36. *Ibid*
37. Chirol, *op cit.*, p. 33.
38. Jawaharlal Nehru : *An Autobiography*, p. 24.
39. Rajni Palme Dutt: *India Today*, p. 328.
40. L.F. Rushbrook Williams : "The Indian National Congress in its Various Phases" in Sir John Cumming (ed.) : *Political India, 1832-1932*, p. 39.

CONTENTS

PART II : BRITISH COLONIAL INTERPRETATIONS AND PRONOUNCEMENTS

PART I

PROMINENT EXTREMIST AND MILITANT NATIONALISTS

FREEDOM

Men ! Whose boast it is that ye,
Come of fathers brave and free,
If there breathes on earth a slave,
Are you truly free and brave ?
When it works a brother's pain,
Are you not base slaves indeed,
Slaves unworthy to be freed ?

Is true freedom but to break,
Fetters for our own dear sake,
And with leathern hearts, forget
That we owe mankind a debt ?
No, true freedom is to share
All the chains our brothers wear,
And, with heart and head, to be
Earnest to make others free !

They are slaves who fear to speak,
For the fallen and the weak ;
They are slaves who will not choose,
Hatred, scoffing and abuse,
Rather than in silence shrink ;
They are slaves who dare not be,
In the night with two or three.

—James Russel Cowell

(A page from the diary of Shaheed Bhagat Singh while in Central Jail, Lahore)

1

SWAMI VIVEKANAND

[Apart from taking inspiration from the principles of Western civilisation, culture and history, modern Indian nationalism had its sustaining force in the glorification of India's grand past as well. The name of Swami Vivekanand (1863-1902) is very important in this direction who is regarded as the 'hero-prophet of Hinduism' within whom there was 'a Napoleon' (Romain Rolland). He interpreted the case of Indian nationalism in the light of the metaphysical foundations of Hindu religion and philosophy. Like Swami Dayanand Saraswati, he strongly denounced the Europeanisation of India and succeeded in imparting a dynamic and spiritual fervour to the formation of culture complex of India. His exhortation to the people of the country to 'be bold' had an electrical effect on the pioneers of the extremist trend. He delivered the message that India should not only be free from foreign rule, she has a mission to conquer the whole world by the force of her spiritualism In this respect, he imparted an entirely new dimension to the philosophy of Indian nationalism. Moreover, by raising his voice for the upliftment of the poor and down-trodden masses, he carved out a socialistic dimension to Indian nationalism. On the whole, he mixed up the basic tenets of spiritual revivalism, idealism, socialism and universalism with the broad philosophy of Indian nationalism.]

THE WORK BEFORE US*

The problem of life is becoming deeper and broader every day as the world moves on. The watchword and the essence

*A lecture delivered at Triplicane Literary Society, Madras.

have been preached in the days of yore, when the Vedantic truth was first discovered, the solidarity of all life. One atom in this universe cannot move without dragging the whole world along with it. There cannot be any progress without the whole world following in the wake, and it is becoming every day clearer that the solution of any problem can never be attained on racial, or national, or narrow grounds. Every idea has to become broad till it covers the whole of this world, every aspiration must go on increasing till it has engulfed the whole of humanity, nay the whole of life, within its scope. This will explain why our country for the last few centuries has not been what she was in the past. We find that one of the causes which led to this degeneration was the narrowing of our view, narrowing the scope of our actions.

Two curious notions there have been,—sprung of the same race, but placed in different circumstances and environments, working out the problems of life each in its own particular way. I mean the ancient Hindu and the ancient Greek. The Indian Aryan, bounded on the north by the snow-caps of the Himalayas, with fresh-water rivers like rolling oceans surrounding him in the plains, with eternal forests which, to him, seemed to be the end of the world,—turned his vision inward ; and given the natural instinct the superfine brain of the Aryan, with this sublime scenery surrounding him, the natural result was—that he became introspective. The analysis of his own mind was the great theme of the Indo-Aryan. With the Greek, on the other hand, who arrived at a part of the earth which was more beautiful than sublime, the beautiful islands of the Grecian Archipelagos nature all around him generous yet simple,—his mind naturally went outside. It wanted to analyse the external world. And as a result, we find that from India have sprung all the analytical sciences, and from Greece all the sciences of generalisation. The Hindu mind went on in its own direction and produced the most marvellous results. Even at the present day, the logical capacity of the Hindus, and the tremendous power which the Indian brain still possesses is beyond compare. We all know that our boys pitched against the boys of any other country triumph always. At the same time, when the national vigour went, perhaps one or two

centuries before the Mohamedan conquest of India, this national faculty became so much exaggerated that it degraded itself, and we find some of this degradation in everything in India, in art, in music, in sciences, in everything. In art no more was there a broad conception, no more the symmetry of form and sublimity of conception, but the tremendous attempt at the ornate and florid style had arisen. The originality of the race seemed to have been lost. In music no more were there the soul-stirring ideas of the ancient Sanskrit music, no more did each note stand, as it were, on its own feet, and produce the marvellous harmony, but each note had lost its individuality. The whole of modern music is a jumble of notes, a confused mass of curves. That is a sign of degradation in music. So, if you analyse your idealistic conceptions, you will find the same attempt at ornate figures, and loss of originality. And even in religion, your special field, there came the most horrible degradations. What can you expect of a race which for hundreds of years has been busy in discussing such momentous problems as whether we should drink a glass of water with the right hand or the left ? What more degradation can there be than that the greatest minds of a country have been discussing about the kitchen for several hundreds of years, discussing whether I may touch you or you touch me, and what is the penance for this touching ! The themes of the Vedanta, the sublimest and the most glorious conceptions of God and soul ever preached on earth, were half-lost, buried in the forests, preserved by a few Sannyasins, while the rest of the nation discussed the momentous questions of touching each other, and dress the food. The Mohammedan conquest gave us many good things, no doubt : even the lowest man in the world can teach something to the highest ; at the same time it could not bring vigour into the race. Then for good or evil, the English conquest of India took place. Of course every conquest is bad, for conquest is an evil, foreign Government is an evil, no doubt, but even through evil comes good sometimes, and the great good of the English conquest is this : England, nay the whole of Europe, has to thank Greece for its civilisation. It is Greece that speaks through everything in Europe. Every building, every piece of furniture has the impress of Greece upon it ; European science and art are

nothing but Grecian. To-day the ancient Greek is meeting the ancient Hindu on the soil of India. Thus, slowly and silently, the leaven has come, the broadening out, the life-giving, and the revivalist movement, that we see all around us, has been worked out by these forces together. A broader and more generous conception of life is before us, and although at first we have been deluded a little and wanted to narrow things down, we are finding out to-day that these generous impulses which are at work, these broader conceptions of life, are the logical interpretation of what is in our ancient books. They are the carrying out, to the rigorously logical effect, of the primary conceptions of our own ancestors. To become broad, to go out, to amalgamate, to universalise, is the end of our aims. And all the time we have been making ourselves smaller and smaller, and dissociating ourselves, contrary to the plans laid down in our Scriptures.

Several dangers are in the way, and one is that of the extreme conception that we are the people in the world. With all my love for India, and with all my patriotism, and veneration for the ancients, I cannot but think that we have to learn many things from other nations. We must be always ready to sit at the feet of all, for, mark you, every one can teach us great lessons. Says our geat law-giver Manu : "Receive some good knowledge even from the low born and even from the man of lowest birth, learn by service the road to heaven." We, therefore, as true children of Manu, must obey his commands, and be ready to learn the lessons of this life, or the life hereafter from any one who can teach us. At the same time we must not forget, that we have also to teach a great lesson to the world. We cannot do without the world outside India ; it was our foolishness that we thought we could, and we have paid the penalty by about a thousand years of slavery. That we did not go out to compare things with other nations, did not mark the workings that have been all around us, has been the one great cause of this degradation of the Indian mind. We have paid the penalty ; let us do it no more. All such foolish ideas, that Indians must not go out of India, are childish. They must be knocked on the head ; the more you go out and travel among the nations of the world, the better

for you and for your country. If you had done that for hundreds of years past you would not be here to-day, at the feet of every nation that wants to rule India. The first manifest effect of life is expansion. You must expand if you want to live. The moment you have ceased to expand, ceath is upon you, danger is ahead. I went to America and Europe, to which you so kindly allude ; I had to, because that is the first sign of the revival of national life, expansion This reviving national life, expanding inside, threw me off and thousands will be thrown off in that way. Mark my words, it has got to come if this nation lives at all. This question, therefore, is the greatest of the signs of the revival of national life, and through this expansion our quota of offering to the general mass of human knowledge, our contribution to the general upheaval of the world, is going out to the external world. Again, this is not a new thing. Those of you who think that the Hindus have been always confined within the four walls of their country through all ages, are entirely mistaken ; you have not studied the old books, you have not studied the history of the race aright if you think so. Each nation must give in order to live. When you give life you will have life ; when you receive you must pay for it by giving to all others, and that we have been living for so many thousands of years is a fact that stares us in the face, and the solution that remains is that we have been always giving to the outside world, whatever the ignorant may think.

But the gift of India is the gift of religion and philosophy, and wisdom, and spirituality, and religion does not want cohorts to march before its path and clear its way. Wisdom and philosophy do not want to be carried on floods of blood. Wisdom and philosophy do not march upon bleeding human bodies, do not march with violence but come on the wings of peace and love, and that has always been so. Therefore we had to give. I was asked by a young lady in London, "What have you Hindus done ? You have never even conquered a single nation." That is true from the point of view of the Englishman, the brave, the heroic, the Kshatriya—conquest is the greatest glory that one man can have over another. That is true from his point of view, but from ours it is quite the opposite. If I

ask myself what has been the cause of India's greatness. I answer, because we have never conquered. That is our glory. You are hearing every day, and sometimes, I am sorry to say, from men who ought to know better, denunciations of our religion, because it is not at all a conquering religion. To my mind that is the argument why our religion is truer than any other religion, because it never conquered, because it never shed blood, because its mouth always shed on all words of blessing, of peace, words of love and sympathy. It is here and here alone that the ideals of toleration were first preached; and it is here and here alone that toleration and sympathy have become practical; it is theoretical in every other country; it is here and here alone, that the Hindu builds mosques for the Mohammedans and churches for the Christians. So, you see, our message has gone out to the world many a time, but slowly, silently, unperceived. It is on a par with everything in India. The one characteristic of Indian thought is its silence, its calmness. At the same time, the tremendous power that is behind it is never expressed by violence. It is always the silent mesmerism of Indian thought. If a foreigner takes up our literature to study, at first it is disgusting to him; there is not the same stir, perhaps, the same amount of go that rouses him instantly. Compare the tragedies of Europe with our tragedies. The one is full of action, that rouses you for the moment, but when it is over there comes the reaction, and everything is gone, washed off as it were from your brains. Indian tragedies are like the mesmerist's power, quiet, silent, but as you go on studying them they fascinate you; you cannot move; you are bound; and whoever has dared to touch our literature has felt the bondage, and is there bound for ever.

Like the gentle dew that falls unseen and unheard, and yet brings into blossom the fairest of roses, has been the contribution of India to the thought of the world. Silent, unperceived, yet omnipotent in its effect, it has revolutionised the thought of the world, yet nobody knows when it did so. It was once remarked to me, "How difficult it is to ascertain the name of any writer in India," to which I replied, "That is the Indian idea." Indian writers are not like modern writers, who steal ninety per cent of their ideas from other authors, while only

ten per cent is their own, and they take care to write a preface in which they say, "For these ideas I am responsible." Those great master-minds producing momentous results in the hearts of mankind, were content to write their books without even putting their names, and to die quietly, leaving the books to posterity. Who knows the writers of our philosophy, who knows the writers of our Puranas? They all pass under the generic name of Vyasa, and Kapila, and so on. They have been true children of Sri Krishna. They have been true followers of the Gita ; they practically carried out the great mandate, "To work you have the right, but not to the fruits thereof."

Thus, India is working upon the world, but one condition is necessary. Thoughts, like merchandise, can only run through channels made by somebody. Roads have to be made before even thought can travel from one place to another, and whenever in the history of the world a great conquering nation has arisen, linking the different parts of the world together, then has poured through these channels to thought of India, and thus entered into the veins of every race. Before even the Buddhists were born, there are evidences accumulating every day that Indian thought penetrated the world. Before Buddhism, Vedanta had penetrated into China, into Persia, and the Islands of the Eastern Archipelago. Again, when the mighty mind of the Greek had linked the different parts of the eastern world together, there came Indian thought ; and Christianity with all its boasted civilisation is but a collection of little bits of Indian thought. Ours is the religion of which Buddhism, with all its greatness, is a rebel child, and of which Christianity is a very patchy imitation. One of these cycles has again arrived. There is the tremendous power of England which has linked the different parts of the world together. English roads no more are content like Roman roads to run over lands, but they have also ploughed the deep in all directions From ocean to ocean run the roads of England. Every part of the world has been linked to every other part, and electricity plays a most marvellous part as the new messenger. Under all these circumstances we find again India reviving, and ready to give her own quota to the progress and civilisation of the world. And that I have been forced, as it were, by nature,

to go over and preach to America and England, is the result. Everyone of us ought to have seen that the time had arrived. Everything looks propitious, and Indian thought, philosophical and spiritual, must once more go over and conquer the world. The problem before us, therefore, is assuming larger proportions every day. It is not only that we must revive our own country,—that is a small matter; I am an imaginative man,—and my idea is the conquest of the whole world by the Hindu race.

There have been great conquering races in the world. We also have been great conquerors. The story of our conquest has been described by that noble Emperor of India, Asoka, as the conquest of religion and of spirituality. Once more the world must be conquered by India. This is the dream of my life, and I wish that each one of you who hear me to-day will have the same dream in your minds, and stop not till you have realised the dream. They will tell you every day that we had better look to our own homes first, and then go to work outside. But I will tell you in plain language that work best when you work for others. The best work that you ever did for yourselves was when you worked for others, trying to disseminate your ideas in foreign languages, beyond the seas, and this very meeting is proof how the attempt to enlighted other countries with your thoughts is helping your own country. One-fourth of the effect that has been produced in this country by my going to England and America would not have been brought about had I confined my ideas only to India. This is the great ideal before us, and every one must be ready for it,—the conquest of the whole world by India,—nothing less than that, and we must all get ready for it, strain every nerve for it Let foreigners come and flood the land with their armies, never mind Up, India, and conquer the world with your spirituality! Aye, as has been declared on this soil first, love must conquer hatred, hatred cannot conquer itself. Materialism and all its miseries can never be conquered by materialism. Armies when they attempt to conquer armies only multiply and make brutes of humanity. Spirituality must conquer the West. Slowly they are finding out that what they want is spirituality to preserve them as nations. They are waiting for it, they are eager

for it. Where is the supply to come from ? Where are the men ready to go out to every country in the world with the messages of the great sages of India ? Where are the men who are ready to sacrifice everything, so that this messages shall reach every corner of the world ? Such heroic souls are wanted to help the spread of truth. Such heroic workers are wanted to go abroad and help to disseminate the great truths of the Vedanta. The world wants it ; without it the world will be destroyed. The whole of the Western world is on a volcano which may burst tomorrow, go to pieces tomorrow. They have searched every corner of the world and have found no respite. They have drunk deep of the cup of pleasure and found its vanity. Now is the time to work so that India's spiritual ideas may penetrate deep into the West. Therefore, young men of Madras, I specially ask you to remember this. We must go out, we must conquer the world through our spirituality and philosophy. There is no other alternative, we must do it or die The only condition of national life, of awakened and vigorous national life, is the conquest of the world by Indian thought.

At the same time we must not forget that what I mean by the conquest of the world by spiritual thought, is the sending out of the life-giving principles, not the hundreds of superstitions that we have been hugging to our breasts for centuries. These have to be weeded out even on this soil, and thrown aside, so that they may die for ever. These are the causes of the degradation of the race and will lead to softening of the brain. That brain which cannot think high and noble thoughts, which has lost all power of originality, which has lost all vigour, that brain which is always poisoning itself with all sorts of little superstitions passing under the name of religion, we must beware of. In our sight, here in India, there are several dangers. Of these, the two, Scylla and Charybdis, rank materialism and its opposite, arrant superstition, must be avoided. There is the man to-day who after drinking the cup of Western wisdom, thinks that he knows everything. He laughs at the ancient sages. All Hindu thought to him is arrant trash, philosophy, mere child's prattle, and religion, the superstition of fools. On the other hand, there is the man educated, but a sort of monomaniac, who runs to the other

extreme, and wants to explain the omen of this and that. He has philosophical and metaphysical, and Lord knows what other puerile explanations for every superstition that belongs to his peculiar race, or his peculiar gods, or his peculiar village. Every little village superstition is to him a mandate of the Vedas, and upon the carrying out of it, according to him, depends the national life. You must beware of this. I would rather see everyone of you rank atheists than superstitious fools, for the atheist is alive, and you can make something out of him. But if superstition enters, the brain is gone, the brain is softening, degradation has seized upon the life. Avoid these two. Brave, bold men, these are what we want. What we want is vigour in the blood, strength in the nerves, iron muscles and nerves of steel, not softening namby-pamby ideas. Avoid all these. Avoid all mystery. There is no mystery in religion Is there any mystery in the Vedanta, or in the Vedas, or in the Samhitas, or in the Puranas ? What secret societies did the sages of yore establish to preach their religion ? What sleight-of hand tricks are there recorded, as used by them to bring their grand truths to humanity ? Mystery mongering and superstition are always signs of weakness. These are always signs of degradation and of death. Therefore beware of them ; be strong, and stand on your own feet. Great things are there, most marvellous things. We may call them supernatural things so far as our ideas of nature go, but not one of these things is a mystery. It was never preached on this soil that the truths of religion were mysteries or that they were the property of secret societies sitting on the snow-caps of the Himalayas. I have been in the Himalayas. You have not been there ; it is several hundreds of miles from your homes. I am a Sannyasin, and I have been for the last fourteen years on my feet. These mysterious societies do not exist anywhere Do not run after these superstitions. Better for you and for the race that you become rank atheists, because you would have strength, but there are degradation and death. Shame on humanity that strong men should spend their time on these superstitions, spend all their time in inventing allegories to explain the most rotten superstitions of the world. Be bold ; do not try to explain everything that way. The fact is that we have many superstitions, many bad spots

and sores on our body—there have to be excised, cut off, and destroyed—but these do not destroy our religion, our national life, our spirituality. Every principle of religion is safe, and the sooner these black spots are purged away, the better the principles will shine, the more gloriously. Stick to them.

You hear claims made by every religion as being the universal religion of the world. Let me tell you in the first place that perhaps there never will be such a thing, but if there is a religion which can lay claim to be that, it is only our religion and no other, because every other religion depends on some person or persons. All the other religions have been built round the life of what they think an historical man, and what they think the strength of religion is really the weakness, for disprove the historicity of the man and the whole fabric tumbles to the ground. Half the lives of these great founders of religions have been broken into pieces, and the other half doubted very seriously. As such, every truth that had its sanction only in their words vanishes into air. But the truths of our religion, although we have persons by the score, do not depend upon them. The glory of Krishna is not that he was Krishna, but that he was the great teacher of Vedanta. If he had not been so, his name would have died out of India in the same way as the name of Buddha has done. Thus our allegiance is to the principles always, and not to the persons. Persons are but the embodiments, the illustrations of the principles. If the principles are there, the persons will come by the thousands and millions. If the principle is safe, persons like Buddha will be born by the hundreds and thousands. But if the principle is lost and forgotten and the whole of national life tries to cling round a so-called historical person, woe unto that religion, danger unto that religion! Ours is the only religion that does not depend on a person or persons; it is based upon principles. At the same time these is room for millions of persons. There is ample ground for introducing persons, but each one of them must be an illustration of the principles. We must not forget that. These principles of our religion are all safe, and it should be the life-work of every one of us to keep them safe, and to keep them free from the accumulating dirt and dust of ages. It is strange that in spite

of the degradation that seized upon the race again and again, these principles of the Vedanta were never tarnished. No one, however wicked, ever dared to throw dirt upon them. Our Scriptures are the best preserved Scriptures in the world. Compared to other books there have been no interpolations, no text-torturing, no destroying of the essence of the thought in them. It is there just as it was at first, directing the human mind towards the ideal, the goal.

You find that these texts have been commented upon by different commentators, preached by great teachers, and sects founded upon them, and you find that in these books of the Vedas there are various apparently contradictory ideas. There are certain texts which are entirely Dualistic, others are entirely Monistic. The Dualistic commentator, knowing no better, wishes to knock the Monistic texts on the head. Preachers and priests want to explain them in the Dualistic meaning. The Monistic commentator serves the Dualistic texts in a similar fashion. Now this is not the fault of the Vedas. It is foolish to attempt to prove that the whole of the Vedas is Dualistic. It is equally foolish to attempt to prove that the whole of the Vedas is non-Dualistic. They are Dualistic and non-Dualistic both. We understand them better to-day in the light of newer ideas. These are but different conceptions leading to the final conclusion that both Dualistic and Monistic conceptions are necessary for the evolution of the mind, and therefore the Vedas preach them In mercy to the human race the Vedas show the various steps to the higher goal. Not that they are contradictory, vain words used by the Vedas to delude children; they are necessary, not only for children but for many a grown-up man. So long as we have a body and so long as we are deluded by the idea of our identity with the body, so long as we have five senses and see the external world, we must have a Personal God. For if we have all these ideas, we must take as the great Ramanuja has proved, all the ideas about God and Nature and the individualised soul; when you take the one you have to take the whole triangle—we cannot avoid it. Therefore as long as you see the external world, to avoid a Personal God and a personal soul is arrant lunacy. But there may be times in the lives of sages when the human mind transcends as it were

its own limitations, when man goes even beyond Nature, to the realm of which the Sruti declares—"whence words fall back with the mind without reaching it." "There the eyes cannot reach nor speech nor mind." "We cannot say that we know it, we cannot say that we do not know it." There the human soul transcends all limitations, and then and then alone flashes into the human soul the conception of Monism—I and the whole universe are one. I and Brahman are one. And this conclusion you will find has not only been reached through knowledge and philosophy, but parts of it through the power of love. You read in the Bhagavata, when Krishna disappeared and the Gopis bewailed his disappearance, that at last the thought of Krishna became so prominent in their minds that each one forgot her own body and thought she was Krishna, and began to decorate herself and to play as he did. We understand therefore that this identity comes even through love. There was an ancient Persian Sufi poet, and one of his poems says—"I came to the Beloved and beheld the door was closed ; I knocked at the door and from inside a voice came, 'Who is there ?' I replied, I am.' The door did not open. A second time I came and knocked at the door and the same voice asked, 'Who is there ?' 'I am so-and-so.' The door did not open. A third time I came and the same voice asked, 'Who is there ?' 'I am Thyself, my Love,' and the door opened."

There are therefore many stages and we need not quarrel about them, even if there have been quarrels among the ancient commentators, whom all of us ought to revere, for there is no limitation to knowledge, there is no omniscience exclusively the property of any one in ancient or modern times. If there have been sages and Rishis in the past, be sure that there will be many now. If there have been Vyasas and Valmikis and Sankaracharyas in ancient times, why may not each one of you become a Sankaracharya ? This is another point of our religion that you must always remember, that in all other Scriptures inspiration is quoted as their authority, but this inspiration is limited to a very few persons, and through them the truth came to the masses, and we have all to obey them. Truth came to Jesus of Nazareth and we must all obey him. But the truth

came to the Rishis of India—the Mantra-drashtas, the seers of thought—and will come to all Rishis in the future, not to talkers, not to book-swallowers, not to scholars, not to philologists, but to seers of thought. The Self is not to be reached by too much talking, not even by the highest intellects, not even by the study of the Scriptures. The Scriptures themselves say so. Do you find in any other Scriptures such a bold assertion as that—not even by the study of the Vedas will you reach the Atman ? You must open your heart. Religion is not going to church, or putting marks on the forehead, or dressing in a peculiar fashion ; you may paint yourselves in all the colours of the rainbow, but if the heart has not been opened, if you have not realised God, it is all vain. If one has the colour of the heart he does not want any external colour. That is the true religious realisation. We must not forget that colours and all these things are good so far as they help ; so far they are all welcome, but they are apt to degenerate and instead of helping they retard ; and a man identifies religion with externalities. Going to the temple becomes tantamount to spiritual life. Giving something to a priest becomes tantamount to religious life. These are dangerous, and pernicious, and should be at once checked. Our Scriptures declare again and again that even the knowledge of the external senses is not religion. That is religion which makes us realise the unchangeable One, and that is the religion for every one. He who realises transcendental truth, he who realises the Atman in his own nature, he who comes face to face with God, sees God alone in everything, has become a Rishi. And there is no religious life for you until you have become a Rishi. Then alone religion begins for you, now is only the preparation. Then religion dawns upon you, now you are only undergoing intellectual gymnastics and physical tortures.

We must therefore remember that our religion lays down distinctly and clearly, that every one who wants salvation must pass through the stage of Rishihood,—must become a Mantra-drashta, must see God That is salvation ; that is the law laid down by our Scriptures. Then is becomes easy to look into the Scripture with our own eyes, understand the meaning for ourselves, to analyse just what we want, and to understand the

truth for ourselves. This is what has to be done. At the same time we must pay all reverence to the ancient sages for their work. They were great, these ancients, but we want to be greater. They did great work in the past, but we must do greater work than they. They had hundreds of Rishis in ancient India. We will have millions—we are going to have, and the sooner every one of you believes in this, the better for India and the better for the world. Whatever you believe that you will be. If you believe yourselves to be sages, sages you will be to-morrow. There is nothing to obstruct you. For if there is one common doctrine that runs through all our apparently fighting and contradictory sects, it is that all glory, power and purity are within the soul already; only according to Ramanuja the soul contracts and expands at times, and according to Sankara, it comes under a delusion. Never mind these differeuces. All admit the truth that the power is there—potential or manifest it is there—and the sooner you believe that, the better for you. All power is within you; you can do anything and everything. Believe in that, do not believe that you are weak; do not believe that you are half-crazy lunatics, as most of us do nowadays. You can do anything and everything without even the guidance of any one. All power is there. Stand up and express the Divinity within you.

THE FUTURE OF INDIA

This is the ancient land where wisdom made its home before it went into any other country, the same India whose influx of spirituality is represented, as it were, on the material plane, by rolling rivers like oceans, where the eternal Himalayas, rising tier above tier with their snowcaps, look as it were into the very mysteries of heaven. Here is the same India whose soil has been trodden by the feet of the greatest sages that ever lived. Here first sprang up inquiries into the nature of man, and into the internal world. Here first arose the doctrines of the immortality of the soul, the existence of a supervising God, an immanent God in Nature and in man, and here the highest ideals of religion and philosophy have attained their culminating points. This is the land from whence, like the tidal waves, spirituality and philosophy have again and again rushed out

language, Government—all these together make a nation. The elements which compose the nations of the world are indeed very few taking race after race, compared to this country. Here have been the Aryan, the Dravidian, the Tartar, the Turk, the Mogul, the European,—all the nations of the world, as it were pouring their blood into this land. Of languages the most wonderful conglomeration is here; of manners and customs there is more difference between two Indian races than between the European and the Eastern races.

The one common ground that we have is our sacred traditions, our religion. That is the only common ground, and upon that we shall have to build. In Europe, political ideas form the national unity. In Asia, religious ideals form the national unity. The unity in religion, therefore, is absolutely necessary as the first condition of the future of India. There must be the recognition of one religion throughout the length and breadth of this land. What do I mean by one religion? Not in the sense of one religion as held among the Christians, or the Mohammedans, or the Buddhists. We know that our religion has certain common grounds, common to all our sects, however varying their conclusions may be, however different their claims may be. So there are certain common grounds, and within their limitation this religion of ours admits of a marvellous variation, an infinite amount of liberty to think, and live our own lives. We all know that, at least, those of us who have thought, and what we want is to bring out these life-giving common principles of our religion, and let every man, woman and child throughout the length and breadth of this country, understand them, know them, and try to bring them out in their lives. This is the first step, and therefore it has to be taken. We see how in Asia, and especially in India, race difficulties, linguistic difficulties, social difficulties, national difficulties, all melt away before this unifying power of religion. We know that to the Indian mind there is nothing higher than religious ideals, that this is the key-note of Indian life, and we can only work in the line of least resistance. It is not only true, that the ideal of religion is the highest ideal; in the case of India, it is the only possible means of work; work in any other line, without first streng-

thening this, would be disastrous. Therefore, the first plank in the making of a future India, the first step that is to be hewn out of that rock of ages, is this unification of religion. All of us have to be taught that we Hindus,—Dualists, qualified Monists, or Monists, Shaivas, Vaishnavas, or Pashupatas,—to whatever denomination we may belong, have certain common ideas behind us, and that the time has come when for the well-being of ourselves, for the well-being of our race, we must give up all our little quarrels and differences. Be sure these quarrels are entirely wrong; they are condemned by our Scriptures, forbidden by our forefathers; and those great men from whom we claim our desent, whose blood is in our veins, look down with contempt on their children quarrelling about minute differences.

With the giving up of quarrels all other improvements will come. When the life-blood is strong and pure no disease germ can live in that body. Our life-blood is spirituality. If it flows clear, if it flows strong and pure and vigorous, everything is right; political, social, any other material defects, even the poverty of the land, will all be cured if that blood is pure. For if the disease germ be thrown out, nothing will be able to enter into the blood. To take a simile from modern medicine, we know that there must be two causes to produce a disease, some poison germ outside, and the state of the body. Until the body is in a state to admit the germs, until the body is degraded to a lower vitality so that the germs may enter and thrive and multiply, there is no power in any germ in the world to produce a disease in the body. In fact, millions of germs are continually passing through every-one's body; but so long as it is vigorous it never is conscious of them. It is only when the body is weak that these germs take possession of it and produce disease. Just so with the national life. It is when the national body is weak that all sorts of disease germs, in the political state of the race, or in its social state, or in its educational or intellectual state, crowd into the system and produce disease. To remedy it, therefore, we must go to the root of this disease and cleanse the blood of all impurities. The one tendency will be to strengthen the man, to make the blood pure, the body vigorous, so that it will

be able to resist and throw off all external poisons. We have seen that our vigour, our strength, nay, our national life is in our religion. I am not going to discuss now whether it is right or not, whether it is correct or not, whether it is beneficial or not in the long run, to have this vitality in religion, but for good or evil it is there; you cannot get out of it, you have it now and for ever, and you have to stand by it, even if you have not the same faith that I have in our religion. You are bound by it, and if you give it up you are smashed to pieces. That is the life of our race and that must be strengthened. You have withstood the shocks of centuries simply because you took great care of it, you sacrificed everything else for it. Your forefathers underwent everything boldly, even death itself, but preserved their religion. Temple after temple was broken down by the foreign conqueror, but no sooner had the wave passed than the spire of the temple rose up again. Some of these old temples of Southern India, and those like Somenath of Gujerat, will teach you volumes of wisdom, will give you a keener insight into the history of the race than any amount of books. Mark how these temples bear the marks of a hundred attacks and a hundred regenerations, continually destroyed and continually springing up out of the ruins, rejuvenated and strong as ever! That is the national mind, that is the national life-current. Follow it and it leads to glory. Give it up and you die: death will be the only result, annihilation the only effect, the moment you step beyond that life-current. I do not mean to say that other things are not necessary. I do not mean to say that political or social improvements are not necessary, but what I mean is this, and I want you to bear it in mind, that they are secondary here, and that religion is primary. The Indian mind is first religious, then anything else. So this is to be strengthened, and how to do it? I will lay before you my ideas. They have been in my mind for a long time, even years before I left the shores of Madras for America. and that I went to America and England was simply for propagating those ideas. I did not care at all for the Parliament of Religions or anything else; it was simply an opportunity; for it was really those ideas of mine that took me all over the world.

My idea is first of all to bring out the gems of spirituality that are stored up in our books, and in the possession of a few only, hidden, as it were, in monasteries and in forests— to bring them out; to bring the knowledge out of them, not only from the hands where it is hidden, but from the still more inaccessible chest, the language in which it is preserved, the incrustation of centuries of Sanskrit words. In one word, I want to make them popular. I want to bring out these ideas and let them be the common property of all, of every man in India, whether he knows the Sanskrit language or not. The great difficulty in the way is the Sanskrit language, this glorious language of ours, and this difficulty cannot be removed until, if it is possible, the whole of our nation are good Sanskrit scholars. You will understand the difficulty when I tell you, that I have been studying this language all my life, and yet every new book is new to me. How much more difficult would it then be for people who never had time to study the language thoroughly! Therefore the ideas must be taught in the language of the people; at the same time, Sanskrit education must go on along with it, because the very sound of Sanskrit words gives a prestige and a power and a strength to the race. The attempts of the great Ramanuja, and of Chaitanya and of Kabir to raise the lower classes of India, show that marvellous results were attained during the lifetime of those great prophets; yet the later failures have to be explained, and cause shown why the effect of their teachings stopped almost within a century of the passing away of these great Masters. The secret is here. They raised the lower classes; they had all the wish that these should come up, but they did not apply their energies to the spreading of the Sanskrit language among the masses Even the great Buddha made one false step when he stopped the Sanskrit language from being studied by the masses He wanted rapid and immediate results, and translated and preached in the language of the day, Pali. That was grand, he spoke in the language of the people, and the people understood him That was great: it spread the ideas quickly and made them reach far and wide, but along with that, Sanskrit ought to have spread Knowledge came but the prestige was not there, culture was not there. It is culture that withstands shocks, not a simple mass of knowledge. You can put a mass

of knowledge into the world, but that will not do it much good. There must come culture into the blood. We all know in modern times, of nations which have masses of knowledge, but what of them ? They are like tigers, they are like savages, because culture is not there. Knowledge is only skin-deep, as civilisation is, and a little scratch brings out the old savage ; such things happen ; this is the danger. Teach the masses in the vernaculars, give them ideas ; they will get information, but something more is necessary ; give them culture. Until you give them that, there can be no permanence in the raised condition of the masses. There will be another caste created, having the advantage of the Sanskrit language, which will quickly get above the rest and rule them all the same. The only safety, I tell you men who belong to the lower castes, the only way to raise your condition is to study Sanskrit, and this fighting and writing and frothing against the higher castes is in vain, it does no good, and it creates fight and quarrel, and this race, unfortunately already divided, is going to be divided more and more. The only way to bring about the levelling of caste is to appropriate the culture, the education which is the strength of the higher castes. That done, you have what you want.

In connection with this I want to discuss one question which has a particular bearing with regard to Madras. There is a theory that there was a race of mankind in Southern India called Dravidians, entirely differing from another race in Northern India called the Aryans, and that the Southern India Brahmans are the only Aryans that came from the North, the other men of Southern India belong to an entirely different caste and race to those of Southern India Branmans. Now I beg your pardon, Mr. Philologist, this is entirely unfounded. The only proof of it is, that there is a difference of language between the North and the South. I do not see any other difference. We are so many Northern men here, and I ask my European friends to pick out the Northern and Southern men from this assembly. Where is the difference ? A little difference of language. But the Brahmans are a race that came here speaking the Sanskrit language ! Well then, they took up the Dravidian language and forgot their Sanskrit. Why should

not the other castes have done the same ? Why should not all the other castes have come one after the other from Northern India, taken up the Dravidian language, and so forgotten their own ? That is an argument working both ways. Do not believe in such silly things. There may have been a Dravidian people who vanished from here, and the few, who remained, lived in forests and other places. It is quite possible that the language may have been taken up, but all these are Aryans who came from the North. The whole of India is Aryan, nothing else. Then there is the other idea that the Sudra caste are surely the aborigines. What are they ? They are slaves. They say history repeats itself. The Americans, English, Dutch, and the Portuguese got hold of the poor Africans, and made them work hard while they lived, and their children of mixed birth were born in slavery and kept in that condition for a long period. From that wonderful example, the mind jumps back several thousand years and fancies that the same thing happened here, and our archaeologist dreams of India being full of dark-eyed aborigines, and the bright Aryan came from —the Lord knows where. According to some, they came from Central Thibet, others will have it that they came from Central Asia. There are patriotic Englishmen who think that the Aryans were all red-haired. Others, according to their idea, think that they were all black-haired. If the writer happens to be a black-haired man, the Aryans were all black-haired. Of late, there was an attempt made to prove that the Aryans lived on the Swiss lakes. I should not be sorry if they had been all drowned there, theory and all. Some say now that they lived at the North Pole. Lord bless the Aryans and their habitations ! As for the truth of these theories, there is not one word in our Scriptures, not one, to provide that the Aryan ever came from anywhere outside of India, and in ancient India was included Afghanistan. There it ends. And the theory that the Sudra caste were all non-Aryans and they were a multitude, is equally illogical and equally irrational. It could not have been possible in those days that a few Aryans settled and lived there with a hundred thousand slaves at their command. These slaves would have eaten them up, made 'chutney' of them in five minutes. The only explanation is to be found in the Mahabharata, which says, that in the beginning

of the Satya Yuga there was one caste, the Brahmans, and then by difference of occupations they went on dividing themselves into different castes, and that is the only true and rational explanation that has been given. And in the coming Satya Yuga all the other castes will have to go back to the same condition. The solution of the caste problem in India, therefore, assumes this form, not to degrade the higher castes, not to crush out the Brahman.

The Branmanhood is the ideal of humanity in India, as wonderfully put forward by Sankaracharya at the beginning of his commentary on the Gita, where he speaks about the reason for Krishna's coming as a preacher for the preservation of Brahmanhood, of Brahmanness. That was the great end. This Brahman, the man of God, he who has known Brahman, the ideal man, the perfect man, must remain ; he must not go. And with all the defects of the caste now, we know that we must all be ready to give to the Brahmans this credit, that from them have come more men with real Brahmanness in them than from all the other castes. That is true. That is the credit due to them from all the other castes. We must be bold enough, must be brave enough to speak of their defects, but at the same time we must give the credit that is due to them. Remember the old English proverb. 'Give every man his due.' Therefore, my friends, it is no use fighting among the castes. What good will it do ? It will divide us all the more, weaken us all the more, degrade us all the more. The days of exclusive privileges and exclusive claims are gone, gone for ever from the soil of India, and it is one of the great blessings of the British Rule in India Even to the Mohammedan Rule we owe that great blessing, the destruction of exclusive privilege. That Rule was, after all, not all bad ; nothing is all bed, and nothing is all good. The Mohammedan conquest of India came as salvation to the down-trodden, to the poor. That is why, one-fifth of our people have become Mohammedans. It was not the sword that did it all. It would be the height of madness to think it was all the work of sword and fire. And one-fifth—one-half—of your Madras people will become Christians if you do not take care. Was there ever a sillier thing before in the world than what I saw in Malabar country ?

The poor parish is not allowed to pass through the same street as the high caste man, but if he changes his name to a hodge-podge English name, it is all right ; or to a Mohammedan name, it is all right. What inference would you draw except that these Malabaris are all lunatics, their homes so many lunatic asylums, and that they are to be treated with derision by every race in India until they mend their manners and know better. Shame upon them that such wicked and diabolical customs are allowed ; their own children are allowed to die of starvation, but as soon as they take up some other religion they are well fed. There ought to be no more fight between the castes.

The solution is not by bringing down the higher, but by raising the lower up to the level of the higher. And that is the line of work that is found in all our books, in spite of what you may hear from some people whose knowledge of their own Scriptures and whose capacity to understand the mighty plans of the ancients are only zero. They do not understand, but those do that have brains, that have the intellect to grasp the whole scope of the work. They stand aside and follow the wonderful procession of national life through the ages. They can trace it step by step through all the books, ancient and modern. What is the plan ? The ideal at one end is the Brahman and the ideal at the other end is the Chandala, and the whole work is to raise the Chandala up to the Brahman. Slowly and slowly you find more and more privileges granted to them. There are books where you read such fierce words as these : "If the Sudra hears the Vedas, fill his ears with molten lead, and if he remembers a line, cut his tongue out. If he says to the Brahmin, 'You Brahman,' cut his tongue out." This is diabolical old barbarism, no doubt, that goes without saying ; but do not blame the law-givers, who simply record the customs of some section of the community. Such devils sometimes arose among the ancients. There have been devils everywhere more or less in all ages. Accordingly, you will find that later on, this tone is modified a little ; as for instance—"Do not disturb the Sudras but do not teach them higher things." Then gradually we find in other Smritis, especially in those that have full power now, that if the Sudras imitate the manners and customs of the Brahmans they do well, they

ought to be encouraged. Thus it is going on. I have no time to place before you all these workings, nor how they can be traced in detail ; but coming to plain facts, we find that all the castes are to rise slowly and slowly ; however, there are thousands of castes and some are even getting admission into Brahmanhood, for what prevents any caste from declaring they are Brahmans ? Thus caste, with all its rigour, has been created in that manner. Let us suppose that there are castes here with ten thousand people in each If these put their heads together and say, we will call ourselves Brahmans, nothing can stop them ; I have seen it in my own life. Some castes become strong, and as soon as they all agree, who is to say nay ? Because whatever it was, each caste was exclusive of the other. It did not meddle with others' affairs ; even the several divisions of one caste did not meddle with the other divisions, and those powerful epoch-makers, Sankaracharya and others, were the great caste-makers. I cannot tell you all the wonderful things they fabricated, and some of you may resent what I have to say. But in my travels and experience I have traced them out, and have arrived at most wonderful results. They would sometimes get hordes of Beluchees and at once make them Kshatriyas, also get hold of hordes of fishermen and make them Brahmans forthwith. They were all Rishis and sages and we have to bow down to their memory. So, be you all Rishis and sages ; that is the secret. More or less we shall all be Rishis. What is meant by a Rishi ?—the pure one. Be pure first, and you will have power. Simply saying "I am a Rishi," will not do, but when you are a Rishi you will find that others obey you instinctively. Something mysterious emanates from you, which makes them follow you, makes them hear you, makes them unconsciously, even against their will, carry out your plans. That is Rishihood.

Now, as to the details, they, of course, have to be worked out through generations. But this is merely a suggestion in order to show you that these quarrels should cease. Especially do I regret that in modern times there should be so much discussion between the castes. This must stop. It is useless on both sides, especially on the side of the higher caste, the Brahman, because, the day for these privileges and exclusive

claims is gone. The duty of every aristocracy is to dig its own grave, and the sooner it does so, the better. The more it delays, the more it will fester and the worse death it will die. It is the duty of the Brahman, therefore, to work for the salvation of the rest of mankind, in India. If he does that and so long as he does that, he is a Brahman, but he is no Brahman, when he goes about making money. You on the other hand should give help only to the real Brahman, who deserves it; that leads to heaven, but sometimes a gift to another person who does not deserve it, leads to the other place, says our Scripture. You must be on your guard about that. He only is the Brahman who has no secular employment. Secular employment is not for the Brahman but for the other castes. To the Brahmans I appeal, that they must work hard to raise the Indian people by teaching them what they know, by giving out the culture that they have accumulated for centuries. It is clearly the duty of the Brahmans of India to remember what real Brahmanhood is. As Manu says, all these privileges and honours are given to the Brahman because, "with him is the treasury of virtue." He must open that treasury and distribute its valuables to the world. It is true that he was the earliest preacher to the Indian races, he was the first to renounce everything in order to attain to the higher realisation of life, before others could reach to the idea. It was not his fault that he marched ahead of the other castes. Why did not the other castes so understand and do as they did ? Why did they sit down and be lazy, and let the Brahmans win the race ? But it is one thing to gain an advantage, and another thing to preserve it for evil use. Whenever power is used for evil it becomes diabolical ; it must be used for good only. So this accumulated culture of ages of which the Brahman has been the trustee, he must now give to the people at large, and it was because he did not give it to the people, that the Mohammedan invasion was possible. It was because he did not open this treasury to the people from the beginning, that for a thousand years we have been trodden under the heels of every one who chose to come to India ; it was through that we have become degraded, and the first task must be to break open the cells that hide the wonderful treasures which our common ancestors accumulated ; bring them out, and give them to everybody, and the Brahman

must be the first to do it. There is an old superstition in Bengal that if the cobra that bites, sucks out his own poison from the patient, the man must survive. Well then, the Brahman must suck out his own poison. To the non-Brahman castes I say, wait, be not in a hurry. Do not seize every opportunity of fighting the Brahman, because as I have shown, you are suffering from your own fault. Who told you to neglect spirituality and Sanskrit learning ? What have you been doing all this time ? Why have you been indifferent ? Why do you now fret and fume because somebody else had more brains, more energy, more pluck and go, than you ? Instead of wasting your energies in vain discussions and quarrels in the newspapers, instead of fighting and quarrelling in your own homes, —which is sinful,—use all your energies in acquiring the culture which the Brahman has, and the thing is done. Why do you not become Sanskrit scholars ? Why do you not spend millions to bring Sanskrit education to all the castes of India ? That is the question. The moment you do these things, you are equal to the Brahman. That is the secret of power in India.

Sanskrit and prestige go together in India. As soon as you have that, none dares say anything against you. That is the one secret ; take that up. The whole universe, to use the ancient Advaitist's simile, is in a state of self hypnotism. It is will that is the power. It is the man of strong will that throws, as it were, a halo round him and brings all other people to the same state of vibration as he has in his own mind. Such gigantic men do appear. And what is the idea ? When a powerful individual appears, his personality infuses his thoughts into us, and many of us come to have the same thoughts and thus we become powerful. Why is it that organisations are so powerful ? Do not say organisation is material. Why is it, to take a case in point, that forty millions of Englishmen rule three hundred millions of people here ? What is the psychological explanation ? These forty millions put their wills together and that means infinite power, and you three hundred millions have a will each separate from the other. Therefore to make a great future India, the whole secret lies in organisation, accumulation of power, co-ordination of wills. Already before my mind

rises one of the marvellous verses of the Atharva Veda Samhita which says, "Be thou all of one mind, be thou all of one thought, for in the days of yore, the gods being of one mind were enabled to receive oblations. That the gods can be worshipped by men is because they are of one mind." Being of one mind is the secret of society. And the more you go on fighting and quarrelling about all trivialities such as "Dravidian" and "Aryan," and the question of Brahmans and non-Brahmans and all that, the further you are off from that accumulation of energy and power which is going to make the future India. For mark you, the future India depends entirely upon that. This is the secret accumulation of will-power, co-ordination, bringing them all, as it were, into one focus. Each Chinaman thinks in his own way, and a handful of Japanese all think in the same way, and you know the result. That is how it goes throughout the history of the world. You find in every case, compact little nations always governing and ruling huge unwieldy nations and that is natural, because it is easier for the little compact nations to bring their ideas into the same focus, and thus they become developed. And the bigger the nation, the more unwieldy it is. Born, as it were, a disorganised mob, they cannot combine. All these dissensions must stop.

There is yet another defect in us. Ladies, excuse me, but through centuries of slavery, we have become like a nation of women. You scarcely can get three women together for five minutes in this country, or any other country but they quarrel. Women make big societies in European countries, and make tremendous declarations of women's power and so on; then they quarrel, and some man comes and rules them all. All over the world they still require some man to rule them. We are like them. Women we are. If a woman comes to lead women they all begin immediately to criticise her, tear her to pieces, and make her sit down. If a man comes and gives them a little harsh treatment, scolds them now and then, it is all right, they have been used to that sort of mesmerism. The whole world is full of such mesmerists and hypnotists. In the same way, if one of our countrymen stands up and tries to become great, we all try to hold him down, but *if a foreigner comes*

and tries to kick us, it is all right. We have been used to it, have we not? And slaves must become great masters! So give up being a slave. For the next fifty years this alone shall be our keynote,—this, our great Mother India. Let all other vain Gods disappear for that time from our minds. This is the only God that is awake our own race, everywhere His hands, everywhere His feet, everywhere His ears, He covers everything. All other Gods are sleeping What vain Gods shall we go after and yet cannot worship the God that we see all round us, the Virat? When we have worshipped this, we shall be able to worship all other Gods. Before we can crawl half a mile, we want to cross the ocean, like Hanuman! It cannot be. Everyone going to be a Yogi, everyone going to meditate! It cannot be. The whole day mixing with the world, with Karmakanda, and in the evening sitting down and blowing through your nose! Is it so easy? Should Rishis come flying through the air, because you have blown three times through the nose? Is it a joke? It is all nonsense. What is needed is Chittashuddhi, purification of the heart. And how does that come? The first of all worship is the worship of the Virat,—of those all around us. Worship It. Worship is the exact equivalent of the Sanskrit word, and no other English word will do. These are all our Gods,—men and animals, and the first Gods we have to worship are our own countrymen. These we have to worship, instead of being jealous of each other and fighting each other. It is the most terrible Karma for which we are suffering, and yet it does not open our eyes!

Well, the subject is so great that I do not know where to stop, and I must bring my lecture to a close by placing before you in a few words the plans I want to carry out in Madras. We must have a hold on the spiritual and secular education of the nation. Do you understand that? You must dream it, you must talk it, you must think it, and you must work it out. Till then there is no salvation for the race. The education that you are getting now has some good points, but it has a tremendous disadvantage which is so great that the good things are all weighed down. In the first place it is not a man-making education, it is merely and entirely a negative education. A negative education or any training that is based on negation, is worse

than death. The child is taken to school, and the first thing he learns is that his father is a fool, the second thing, that his grandfather is a lunatic, the third thing that all his teachers are hypocrites, the fourth, that all the sacred books are lies ! By the time he is sixteen he is a mass of negation, lifeless and boneless. And the result is, that fifty years of such education has not produced one original man in the three Presidencies. Every man of originality that has been produced has been educated elsewhere, and not in this country, or they have gone to the old universities once more to cleanse themselves of superstitions. Education is not the amount of information that is put into your brain and runs riot there, undigested, all your life. We most have life-building, man-making, character-making, assimilation of ideas. If you have assimilated five ideas and made them your life and character, you have more education than any man who has got by heart a whole library. यथा खरश्चन्दनभारवाही भारस्य वेत्ता न तु चन्दनस्य । "The ass carrying its load of sandalwood knows only the weight and not the value of the sandalwood." If education is identical with information, the libraries are the greatest sages in the world, and encyclopaedias and the Rishis. The ideal therefore is, that we must have the whole education of our country, spiritual and secular, in our own hands, and it must be on national lines, through national methods, as far as practical. Of course this is a very big scheme, a very big plan. I do not know whether it will ever work out. But we must begin the work. But how ? Take Madras, for instance. We must have a temple, for with Hindus, religion must come first. Then, you may say, all sects will quarrel about it. But we will make it a non-sectarian temple, having only "Om," as the symbol, the greatest symbol of any sect. If there is any sect here, which believes that "Om" ought not to be the symbol, it has no right to call itself Hindu. All will have the right to interpret Hinduism, each one according to his own sect's ideas, but we must have a c mmon temple. You can have your own images and symbols in other places, but do not quarrel here with those who differ from you. Here should be taught the common grounds of our different sects, and at the same time the different sects should have perfect liberty to come and teach their doctrines, with only one restric-

tion, that is, not to quarrel with other sects. Say what you have to say, the world wants it, but the world has no time to hear what you think about other people ; you can keep that to yourselves. Secondly, in connection with this temple there should be an institution to train teachers who must go about preaching religion and giving secular education to our people ; they must carry both. As we have been already carrying religion from door to door, let us along with it carry secular education also. That can be easily done. Then the work will extend through these bands of teachers and preachers, and gradually we shall have similar temples in other places, until we have covered the whole of India. That is my plan. It may appear gigantic, but it is much needed. You may ask, where is the money. Money is not needed. Money is nothing. For the last twelve years of my life, I did not know where the next meal would come from ; but money and everything else I want must come, because they are my slaves, and not I theirs ; money and everything else must come. Must,—that is the world. Where are the men ? That is the question. Young men of Madras, my hope is in you. Will you respond to the call of your nation ? Each one of you has a glorious future if you dare believe me. Have a tremendous faith in yourselves, like the faith I had when I was a child, and which I am working out now. Have that faith, each one of you, in yourself, that eternal power is lodged in every soul, and you will revive the whole of India. Aye, we will then go to every country under the sun, and our ideas will before long be a component of the many forces that are working to make up every nation in the world. We must enter into the life of every race in India and abroad ; we shall have to work to bring this about. Now for that, I want young men. "It is the young, the strong, and healthy, of sharp intellect, that will reach the Lord," say the Vedas. This is the time to decide your future—while you possess the energy of youth, not when you are worn out and jaded, but in the freshness and vigour of youth. Work ; this is the time, for the freshest, the untouched and unsmelled flowers alone are to be laid at the feet of the Lord, and such He receives. Rouse yourselves, therefore, for life is short. There are greater works to be done than aspiring to become lawyers, and picking quarrels, and such things. A far greater work is

this sacrifice of yourselves for the benefit of your race, for the welfare of humanity. What is in this life? You are Hindus, and there is the instinctive belief in you that life is eternal. Sometimes I have young men come and talk to me about Atheism; I do not believe a Hindu can become an atheist. He may read European books, and persuade himself he is a materialist, but it is only for a time. It is not in your blood. You cannot believe what is not in your constitution; it would be a hopeless task for you. Do not attempt that sort of thing. I once attempted it when I was a boy; but it could not be. Life is short, but the Soul is immortal and eternal, and one thing being certain, death, let us therefore take up a great ideal, and give up our whole life to it. Let this be our determination, and may He, the Lord, who "comes again and again for the salvation of His own people," to quote from our Scriptures,—may the great Krishna bless us, and lead us all to the fulfilment of our aims!

REGENERATION OF INDIA*

For the past few weeks, the Hindu public of Madras have been most eagerly expecting the arrival of Swami Vivekananda, the great Hindu Monk of world-wide fame. At the present moment his name is on everybody's lips. In the school, in the college, in the High Court, on the marina and in the streets and bazars of Madras, hundreds of inquisitive spirits may be seen asking when the Swami will be coming. Large numbers of students from the mofussil, who have come up for the University examinations are staying here, awaiting the Swami, and increasing their hostelry bills, despite the urgent call of their parents to return home immediately. In a few days the Swami will be in our midst. From the nature of the receptions received elsewhere in this Presidency, from the preparations being made here, from the triumphal arches erected at Castle Kernan, where the "Prophet" is to be lodged at the cost of the Hindu public, and from the interest taken in the movement by the leading Hindu gentlemen of this city, like the Hon'ble Mr.

*The Missionary Work of the First Hindu Sanyasin to the West and His Plan for India's Regeneration, *Madras Times*, February, 1897.

Justice Subramaniya Iyer, there is no doubt that the Swami will have a grand reception. It was Madras that first recognised the superior merits of the Swami and equipped him for Chicago. Madras will now have again the honour of welcoming the undoubtedly great man who has done so much to raise the prestige of his motherland. Four years ago, when the Swami arrived here, he was practically an obscure individual. In an unknown bungalow at St. Thome he spent nearly two months, all along holding conversations on religious topics and teaching and instructing all comers who cared to listen to him. Even then a few educated young men with "a keener eye" predicted that there was something in the man, "a power" that would lift him above all others, that would pre-eminently enable him to be the leader of men. These young men who were then despised as "misguided enthusiasts," "dreamy revivalists," have now the supreme satisfaction of seeing their Swami, as they love to call him, return to them with a great European and American fame. The mission of the Swami is essentially spiritual. He firmly believes that India, the motherland of spirituality, has a great future before her. He is sanguine that the West will more and more come to appreciate what he regards as the sublime truths of the Vedanta. His great motto is "Help, and not Fight," "Assimilation, and not Destruction," "Harmony and Peace, and not Dissension." Whatever difference of opinion followers of other creeds may have with him, few will venture to deny that the Swami has done yeoman's service to his country in opening the eyes of the Western world to "the good in the Hindu." He will always be remembered as the first Hindu Sannyasin who dared to cross the sea to carry to the West the message of what he believes in as a religions peace.

A representative of our paper interviewed the Swami Vivekananda, with a view to elicit from him an account of the success of his mission in the West. The Swami very courteously received our representative and motioned him to a chair by his side. The Swami was dressed in yellow robes, was calm, serene, and dignified, and appeared inclined to answer any questions that might be put to him. We have given the

Swami's words as taken down in shorthand by our representative.

"May I know a few particulars about your early life ?" asked our representative.

The Swami said :—"Even while I was a student at Calcutta, I was of a religious temperament. I was critical even at that time of my life, mere words would not satisfy me. Subsequently I met Ramakrishna Paramahamsa, with whom I lived for a long time and under whom I studied. After the death of my father I gave myself up to travelling in India and started a little monastery in Calcutta. During my travels, I came to Madras, where I received help from the late Maharajah of Mysore and the Rajah of Ramnad."

"What made Your Holiness carry the mission of Hinduism to Western countries ?"

"I wanted to get experience. My idea as to the key-note of our national downfall is that we do not mix with other nations—that is the one and the sole cause. We never had opportunity to compare notes. We were Kupa-Mandukas (frogs in a well)."

You have done a good deal of travelling in the West ?"

"I have visited a good deal of Europe, including Germany and France, but England and America were the chief centres of my work. At first I found myself in a critical position, owing to the hostile attitude assumed against the people of this country by those who went there from India. I believe the Indian nation is by far the most moral and religious nation in the whole world, and it would be a blasphemy to compare the Hindus with any other nation. At first, many fell foul of me, manufactured huge lies against me by saying that I was a fraud, that I had a harem of wives and half a regiment of children. But my experience of these missionaries, opened my eyes as to what they are capable of doing in the name of religion. Missionaries were nowhere in England. None came to fight me. Mr. Lund went over to America to abuse me

behind my back, but people would not listen to him. I was very popular with them. When I came back to England, I thought this missionary would be at me, but the *Truth* silenced him. In England the social status is stricter than caste is in India. The English Church people are all gentlemen, born, which many of the missionaries are not. They greatly sympathised with me. I think that about thirty English Church clergymen agree entirely with me on all points of religious discussion. I was agreably surprised to find that the English clergymen, though they differed from me, did not abuse me behind my back and stab me in the dark. There is the benefit of caste and hereditary culture."

"What has been the measure of your success in the West ?"

"A great number of people sympathised with me in America—much more than in England. Vituperation by the low-caste missionaries made my cause succeed better. I had no money, the people of India having given me my bare passage-money, which was spent in a very short time. I had to live just as here on the charity of individuals. The Americans are a very hospitable people. In America one-third of the people are Christians, but the rest have no religion, that is, they do not belong to any of the sects, but amongst them are to be found the most spiritual persons. I think the work in England is sound. If I die to-morrow and cannot send any more Sannyasins, still the English work will go on. The Englishman is a very good man. He is taught from his childhood to suppress all his feelings. He is thickheaded, and is not so quick as the Frenchman or the American. He is immensely practical. The American people are too young to understand renunciation. England has enjoyed wealth and luxury for ages. Many people there are ready for renunciation. When I first lectured in England I had a little class of twenty or thirty, which wrs kept going when I left, and when I went back from America I could get an audience of one thousand. In America I could get a much bigger one, as I spent three years in America and only one year in England. I have two Sannyasins—one in England and one in America, and I intend sending Sannyasins to other countries.

"English people are tremendous workers. Give them an idea, and you may be sure that that idea is not going to be lost, provided they catch it. People here have given up the Vedas, and all your philosophy is in the kitchen. The religion of India at present is 'Don't-touchism'—that is a religion which the English people will never accept. The thoughts of our forefathers and the wonderful life-giving principles that they discovered, every nation will take. The biggest guns of the English Church told me that I was putting Vedantism into the Bible The pre ent Hinduism is a degradation. There is no book on philosophy, written to-day, in which something of our Vedantism is not touched upon—even the works of Herbert spencer contain it. The philosophy of the age is Avaitism, everybody talks of it ; only in Europe, they try to be original. They talk of Hindus with contempt, but at the same time swallow the truths given out by the Hindus. Professor Max Muller is a perfect Vedantist, and has done splendid work in Vedantism. He believes in re-incarnation."

"What do you intend doing for the regeneration of India ?"

"I consider that the great national sin is the neglect of the masses, and that is one of the causes of our downfall. No amount of politics would be of any avail until the masses in India are once more well educated, well fed, and well cared for. They pay for our education, they build our temples, but in return they get kicks They are practically our slaves. If we want to regenerate India, we must work for them. I want to start two central institutions at first—one at Madras and the other at Calcutta, for training young men as preachers. I have funds for starting the Calcutta one. English people will find funds for my purpose.

"My faith is in the younger generation, the modern generation, out of them will come my workers They will work out the whole problem, like lions. I have formulated the idea and have given my life to it. If I do not achieve success, some better one will come after me to work it out, and I shall be content to struggle. The one problem you have is to give to

the masses their rights. You have the greatest religion which the world ever saw, and you feed the masses with stuff and nonsense. You have the perennial fountain flowing, and you give them ditch-water. Your Madras graduate would not touch a low-caste man, but is ready to get out of him the money for his education. I want to start at first these two institutions for educating missionaries, to be both spiritual and secular instructors to our masses. They will spread from centre to centre, until we have covered the whole of India. The great thing is to have faith in oneself, even before faith in God ; but the difficulty seems to be that we are losing faith in ourselves day by day. That is my objection against the reformers. The orthodox have more faith and more strength in themselves, in spite of their crudeness ; but the reformers simply play into the hands of Europeans and pander to their vanity. Our masses are gods as compared with those of other countries. This is the only country where poverty is not a crime. They are mentally and physically handsome : but we hated and hated them till they have lost faith in themselves They think they are born slaves Give them their rights, and let them stand on their rights. This is the glory of the American civilisation. Compare the Irishman with knees bent, half-starved, with a little stick and bundle of clothes, just arrived from the ship, with what he is, after a few months' stay in America. He walks boldly and bravely. He has come from a country where he was a slave to a country where he is a brother.

"Believe that the soul is immortal, infinite and all powerful. My idea of education is personal contact with the teacher—Gurugriha-Nasa. Without the personal life of a teacher there would be no education. Take your Universities. What have they done during the fifty years of their existence ? They have not produced one original man. They are merely an examining body. The idea of the sacrifice for the common weal is not yet developed in our nation."

"What do you think of Mrs. Besant and Theosophy ?"

"Mrs. Besant is a very good woman. I lectured at her Lodge in London. I do not know personally much about her. Her knowledge of our religion is very limited ; she picks up

scraps here and there; she never had time to study it thoroughly. That she is one of the most sincere of women, her greatest enemy will concede. She is considered the best speaker in England. She is a Sannyasini. But I do not believe in Mahatmas and Kuthumis. Let her give up her connection with the Theosophical Society, stand on her own footing and preach what she thinks right." Speaking of social reforms, the Swami expressed himself about widow-marriage thus: "I have yet to see a nation whose faith is determined by the number of husbands their widows get."*

REAWAKENING OF HINDUISM ON A NATIONAL BASIS**

In an interview which a representative of "Prabuddha Bharata" had recently with the Swami Vivekananda, that great

*So says Jawaharlal Nehru: "Rooted in the past and full of pride in India's heritage, Vivekanand was yet modern in his approach to life's problems and was a kind of bridge between the past of India and her present.... He was a fine figure of a man, imposing, full of poise and dignity, sure of himself and his mission, and at the same time full of a dynamic and fiery energy and a passion to push India forward. He came as a tonic to the depressed and demoralised Hindu mind and gave it self-reliance and some roots in the past.... Wherever he went, he created a minor sensation not only by his presence but by what he said and how he said it. Having seen this Hindu Sanyasin once, it was difficult to forget him or his message. In America he was called the 'cyclonic Hindu'.... He preached the monism of the Advaita philosophy of the Vedanta and was convinced that only this could be the future religion of thinking humanity.... Caste, which was necessary and desirable in its earlier forms, and meant to develop individuality and freedom, had become a monstrous degradation, the opposite of what it was meant to be and had crushed the masses. Caste was a form of social organisation which was and should be kept separate from religion. Social organisations should change with the changing times. Passionately Vivekanand condemned the meaningless metaphysical discussions and arguments about ceremonials and especially the touch-me-notism of the upper classes." *The Discovery of India*, pp. 356-57.

**From *Prabuddha Bharat*, September, 1898.

Teacher was asked : "What do you consider the distinguishing feature of your movement, Swamiji ?"

"Aggression," said the Swami promptly, "aggression in a religious sense only. Other sects and parties have carried spirituality all over India, but since the days of Buddha we have been the first to break bounds and try to flood the world with missionary zeal."

"And what do you consider to be the function of your movement as regards India ?"

"To find the common bases of Hinduism and awaken the national consciousness to them. At present there are three parties in Inoia included under the term 'Hindu'—the orthodox, the reforming sects of the Mohammedan period, and the reforming sects of the present time. Hindus from North to South are only agreed on one point,—viz , on not eating beef."

"Not in a common love for the Vedas ?"

"Certainly not. That is just what we want to reawaken. India has not yet assimilated the work of Buddha. She is hypnotised by his voice, not made alive by it."

"In what way do you see this importance of Buddhism in India to-day ?"

"It is obvious and overwhelming. You see India never loses anything ; only she takes time to turn everything into bone and muscle. Buddha dealt a blow at animal sacrifice from which India has never recovered ; and Buddha said, "Kill no cows,' and cow-killing is an impossibility with us."

"With which of the three parties you name do you identify yourself, Swamiji ?"

"With all of them. We are orthodox Hindus," said the Swami, "but," he added suddenly with great earnestness and emphasis, "we refuse entirely to identify ourselves with 'Don't-touchism.' That is not Hinduism : it is in none of our books ;

it is an unorthodox superstition which has interfered with national efficiency all along the line."

"Then what you really desire is national efficiency ?"

"Certainly, Can you adduce any reason why India should lie in the ebb-tide of the Aryan nations ? Is the inferior in intellect ? Is the inferior in dexterity ? Can you look at her art, at her mathematics, at her philosophy, and answer 'yes' ? All that is needed is that she should de-hypnotise herself and wake up from her age-long sleep to take her true rank in the hierarchy of nations."

"But India has always had her deep inner life. Are you not afraid, Swamiji, that in attempting to make her active you may take from her, her one great treasure ?"

"Not at all. The history of the past has gone to develop the inner life of India and the activity (*i.e.*, the outer life) of the West. Hitherto these have been divergent. The time has now come for them to unite. Ramakrishna Paramahamsa was alive to the depths of his being, yet on the outer plane who was more active ? This is the secret. Let your life be as deep as the ocean, but let it also be as wide as the sky.

"It is a curious thing," continued the Swami, "that the inner life is often most profoundly developed where the outer conditions are most cramping and limiting. But this is an accidental—not an essential—association, and if we set ourselves right here in India, the world will be 'rightened.' For are we not all one ?"

"Your last remarks, Swamiji, raise another question. In what sense is Sri Ramakrishna a part of this awakened Hinduism ?"

"That is not for me to determine," said the Swami. 'I have never preached personalities. My own life is guided by the enthusiasm of this great soul ; but others will decide for themselves how far they share in this attitude. Inspiration is not filtered out to the world through one channel, however

great. Each generation should be inspired afresh. Are we not all God ?"

"Thank you. I have only one question more to ask you. You have defined the attitude and function of your movement with regard to your own people. Could you in the same way characterise your methods of action as a whole ?"

"Our method," said the Swami, "is very easily described. It simply consists in reasserting the national life. Buddha preached *renunciation*. India heard, and yet in six centuries she reached her greatest height. The secret lies there. The national ideals of India are Renunciation and Service. Intensify her in those channels, and the rest will take care of itself. The banner of the spiritual cannot be raised too high in this country. In it alone is salvation.

THE COMMON BASES OF HINDUISM

On his arrival at Lahore the Swamiji was accorded a grand reception by the leaders, both of the Arya Samaj and of the Sanatan Dharma Sabha. During his brief stay in Lahore Swamiji delivered three lectures. The first of these was on "The Common Bases of Hinduism :" the second on "Bhakti" ; and the third one was the famous lecture on "The Vedanta." On the first occasion he spoke as follows :

This is the land which is held to be the holiest even in holy Aryavarta ; this is the Brahmavarta of which our great Manu speaks. This is the land from whence arose that mighty aspiration after the Spirit, aye, which in times to come, as history shows, is to deluge the world. This is the land where, like its mighty rivers, spiritual aspirations have arisen and joined their strength, till they travelled over the length and breadth of the world, and declared themselves with a voice of thunder. This is the land which had first to bear the brunt of all inroads and invasions into India ; this heroic land had first to bare its bosom to every onslaught of the outer barbarians into Aryavarta. This is the land which, after all its sufferings, has not yet entirely lost its glory and its strength. Here it was that

in later times the gentle Nanak preached his marvellous love for the world. Here it was that his broad heart was opened, and his arms outstretched to embrace the whole world, not only of Hindus, but of Mahommedans too. Here it was that one of the last and one of the most glorious heroes of our race. Guru Govinda Singh, after shedding his blood, and that of his dearest and nearest, for the cause of religion, even when deserted by those for whom this blood was shed, retired into the South to die like a wounded lion struck to the heart, without a word against his country, without a single word of murmur.

Here, in this ancient land of ours, children of the land of five rivers, I stand before you, not as a teacher—for I know very little to teach, but as one who has come from the east to exchange words of greeting with the brothers of the west, to compare notes. Here am I, not to find out differences that exist among us, but to find where we agree. Here am I trying to understand on what ground we may always remain brothers, upon what foundations the voice that has spoken from eternity may become stronger and stronger as it grows. Here am I trying to propose to you something of constructive work and not destructive. For criticism the days are past, and we are waiting for constructive work. The world needs, at times, criticisms, even fierce ones ; but that is only for time and the work for eternity is progress and construction, and not criticism and destruction. For the last hundred years or so, there has been a flood of criticism all over this land of ours, where the full play of Western Science has been let loose upon all the dark spots, and as a result the corners and the holes have become much more prominent than anything else. Naturally enough there arose mighty intellects all over the land, great and glorious, with the love of truth and justice in their hearts, with the love of their country, and above all, an intense love for their religion and their God ; and because these mighty souls felt so deeply, because they loved so deeply, they criticised everything they thought was wrong. Glory unto these mighty spirits of the past ! They have done so much good ; but the voice of the present day is coming to us, telling. 'Enough !" There has been enough of criticism, there has been enough of fault-finding, the time has come for the rebuil-

ding, the reconstructing ; the time has come for us to gather all our scattered forces, to concentrate them into one focus, and through that, to lead the nation on its onward march, which for centuries almost, has been stopped. The house has been cleansed ; let it be inhabited a new. The road has been cleared : march ahead, children of the Aryans !

Centlemen, this is the motive that brings me before you, and, at the start, I may declare to you that I belong to no party and no sect. They are all great and glorious to me, I love them all, and all my life I have been attempting to find what is good and true in them. Therefore, it is my proposal to-night to bring before you points where we are agreed, to find out, if we can, a ground of agreement ; and if through the grace of the Lord such a state of things be possible, let us take it up, and from theory carry it out into practice. We are Hindus. I do not use the word Hindu in any bad sense at all, nor do I agree with those that think there is any bad meaning in it. In old times, it simply meant people who lived on the other side of the Indus ; to-day a good many among those who hate us may have put a bad interpretation upon it, but names are nothing. Upon us depends whether the name Hindu will stand for everything that is glorious, everything that is spiritual, or whether it will remain a name of opprobrium, one designating the down-trodden, the worthless, the heathen. If at present the word Hindu means anything bad, never mind ; by our action let us be ready to show that this is the highest word that any language can invent. It has been one of the principles of my life not to be ashamed of my own ancestors. I am one of the proudest men ever born, but let me tell you frankly, it is not for myself, but on account of my ancestry. The more I have studied the past, the more I have looked back, more and more has this pride come to me, and it has given me the strength and courage of conviction, raised me up from the dust of the earth, and set me working out that great plan laid out by those great ancestors of ours. Children of those ancient Aryans, through the grace of the Lord may you have the same pride, may that faith in your ancestors come into your blood, may it become a part and parcel of your lives, may it work towards the salvation of the world !

· Before trying to find out the precise point where we are all agreed, the common ground of our national life, one thing me must remember. Just as there is an individuality in every man, so there is a national individuality. As one man differs from another in certain particulars, in certain characteristics of his own, so one race differs from another in certain peculiar characteristics ; and just as it is the mission of every man to fulfil a certain purpose in the economy of nature, just as there is a particular line set out for him by his own past Karma, so it is with nations—each nation has a destiny to fulfil, each nation has a message to deliver, each nation has a mission to accomplish. Therefore, from the very start, we must have to understand the mission of our own race, the destiny it has to fulfil, the place it has to occupy in the march of nations, the note which it has to contribute to the harmony of races. In our country, when children, we hear stories how that some serpents have jewels in their heads, and whatever one may do with the serpent, so long as the jewel is there, the serpent cannot be killed. We hear stories of giants and ogres who had souls living in certain little birds, and so long as the bird was safe, there was no power on earth to kill these giants ; you might hack them to pieces, or do what you liked to them, the giants could not die. So with nations, there is a certain point where the life of a nation centres, where lies the nationality of the nation, and until that is touched, that nation cannot die. In the light of this we can understand the most marvellous phenomenon that the history of the world has ever known. Wave after wave of barbarian conquest has rolled over this devoted land of ours. "Allah Ho Akbar !" has rent the skies for hundreds of years, and no Hindu knew what moment would be his last. This is the most suffering and the most subjugated of all the historic land of the world. Yet we still stand practically the same race, ready to face difficulties again and again if necessary, and not only so, of late there have been signs that we are not only strong, but ready to go out, for the sign of life is expansion.

We find to-day that our ideas and thoughts are no more cooped up within the bounds of India, but whether we will it

Prahlada, so long as we hold on to this grandest of all our inheritances, spirituality. If a Hindu is not spiritual I do not call him a Hindu. In other countries a man may be political first, and then he may have a little religion, but here in India the first and the foremost duty of our lives is to be spiritual first, and then, if there is time, let other things come. Bearing this in mind we shall be in a better position to understand why, for our national welfare, we must first seek out at the present day, all the spiritual forces of the race, as was done in days of yore, and will be done in all times to come. National union in India must be a gathering up of its scattered spiritual forces. A nation in India must be a union of those whose hearts beat to the same spiritual tune.

There have been sects enough in this country. There are sects enough, and there will be enough in the future, because this has been the peculiarity of our religion, that in abstract principles so much latitude has been given, that although afterwards so much detail has been worked out, all these details are the working out of principles, broad as the skies above our heads, eternal as Nature herself. Sects, therefore, as a matter of course, must exist here, but what need not exist, is sectarian quarrel. Sects must be, but sectarianism need not. The world would not be the better for sectarianism, but the world cannot move on without having sects. One set of men cannot do everything. The almost infinite mass of energy in the world cannot be managed by a small number of people. Here, at once we see the necessity that forced this division of labour upon us—the division into sects. For the use of spiritual forces let there be sects, but is there any need that we should quarrel, when our most ancient books declare that this differentiation is only apparent, that in spite of all these differences there is a thread of harmony, that beautiful unity, runuing through them all ? Our most ancient books have declared : एकं सद्विप्रा बहुधा वदन्ति—"That which exists is One ; sages call Him by various names". Therefore, if there are these sectarian struggles, if there, if there are these fights among the different sects, if there is jealousy and hatred between the different sects in India, the land where all sects have

always been honoured, it is a shame on us who dare to call ourselves the descendants of those father.

There are certain great principles in which, I think, we —whether Vaishnavas, Saivas, Saktas or Ganapatyas, whether belonging to the ancient Vedantists, or the modern ones, whether belonging to the old rigid sects, or the modern reformed ones—are all one, and whoever calls himself a Hindu, believes in these principles. Of course there is a difference in the interpretation, in the explanation, of these principles, and that difference should be there, and it should be allowed, for our standard is not to bind every man down to our position ; it would be a sin to force every man to work out our own interpretation of things, and to live by our own methods. Perhaps all who are here will agree on the first point, that we believe the Vedas to be the eternal teachings of the secrets of Religion. We all believe that this holy literature is without beginning and without end, coeval with Nature, which is without beginning and without end ; and that all our religious differences, all our religious struggles must end when we stand in the presence of that holy book ; we are all agreed that this is the last court of appeal in all our spiritual differences. We may take different points of view as to what the Vedas are. There may be one sect which regards one portion as more sacred than another, but that matters little, so long as we say that we are all brothers in the Vedas, that out of these venerable, eternal, marvellous books, has come everything that we possess to-day, good, holy, and pure. Well, therefore, if we believe in all this, let this principle first of all be preached, broadcast, throughout the length and breadth of the land. If this be true, let the Vedas have that prominence which they always deserve, and which we all believe in ; first then the Vedas. The second point we all believe in is God, the creating, the preserving Power of the whole universe, and unto whom it periodically returns, to come out at other periods and manifest this wonderful phenomenon, called the universe. We may differ as to our conception of God. One may believe in a God who is entirely personal, another may believe in a God who is personal and yet not human, and yet another may believe in a God who is entirely impersonal, and all may get

their support from the Vedas. Still we are all believers in God ; that is to say, that man who does not believe in a most marvellous Infinite Power, from which everything has come, in which everything lives, and to which everything must in the end return, cannot be called a Hindu. If that be so, let us try to preach that idea all over the land. Preach whatever conception you have to give, there is no difference, we are not going to fight over it, but preach God ; that is all we want. One idea may be better than another, but, mind you, not one of them is bad. One is good, another is better, and again another may be the best, but the word bad does not enter the category of our religion. Therefore, may the Lord bless them all who preach the name of God in whatever form they like ! The more He is preached, the better for this race. Let our children be brought up in this idea, let this idea enter the homes of the poorest and the lowest, as well as of the richest and the highest,—the idea of the name of God.

The third idea that I will present before you is, that, unlike all other races of the world, we do not believe that this world was created only so many thousand years ago, and is going to be destroyed eternally, on a certain day. Nor do we believe that the human soul has been created along with this universe just out of nothing. Here is another point I think we are all able to agree upon. We believe in Nature being without beginning and without end, only at psychological periods this gross material of the outer universe goes back to its finer state, thus to remain for a certain period, again to be projected outside, to manifest all this infinite panorama we call Nature ; this wavelike motion was going on even before time began, through eternity, and will remain for an infinite period of time. Next, all Hindus believe that man is not only a gross material body, not only that within this there is the finer body, the mind, but there is something yet greater—for the body changes and so does the mind—something beyond, the Atman—I cannot translate the word to you for any translation will be wrong—that there is something beyond even this fine body, which is the Atman of man, which has neither beginning nor end, which knows not what death is, And then this peculiar idea different from that of all other races of men, that this

Atman inhabits body after body until there is no more interest for it to continue to do so, and it becomes free, not to be born again. I refer to the theory of Samsara and the theory of eternal souls taught by our Shastras. This is another point where we all agree, whatever sect we may belong to. There may be differences as to the relation between the soul and God. According to one sect the soul may be gernally different from God, according to another it may be a spark of that infinite fire, yet again according to others it may be one with that Infinite. It does not matter what our interpretation is, so long as we hold on to the one basic belief that the soul is Infinite, that this soul was never created, and therefore will never die, that it had to pass and evolve into various bodies, till it attained perfection in the human one—in that we are all agreed. And then comes the most differentiating, the grandest, and the most wonderful discovery in the realms of spirituality that has ever been made. Some of you, perhaps, who have been studying Western thought, may have observed already, that there is another radical difference severing at one stroke all that is Western from all that is Eastern. It is this that we hold, whether we are Saktas, Saures, or Vaishnavas, even whether we are Bauddhas or Jainas, we all hold in India that the soul is by its nature pure and perfect, infinite in power and blessed. Only, according to the Dualist, this natural blissfulness of the soul has become contracted by past bad work, and, through the grace of God, it is again going to open out and show its perfection, while according to the Monist, even this idea of contraction is a partial mistake, it is the veil of Maya that causes us to think the soul has lost its powers, but the powers are there fully manifest. Whatever the difference may be, we come to the central core, and there is at once an irreconcilable difference between all that is Western and Eastern. The Eastern is looking inward for all that is great and good. When we worship, we close our eyes and try to find God within. The Western is looking up outside for his God. To the Western their religious books have been inspired, while with us our books have been expired ; breath-like they came, the breath of God, out of the hearts of sages they sprang, the Mantra-drashtas.

This is one great point to understand, and, my friends, my brethren, let me tell you, this is the one point we shall have to insist upon in the future. For I am firmly convinced, and I beg you to understand this one fact,—no good comes out of the man who day and night thinks he is nobody. If a man, day and night, thinks he is miserable, low and nothing, nothing he becomes. If you say yea, yea, 'I am, I am,' so shall you be; and if you say 'I am not,' think that you are not, and day and night meditate upon the fact that you are nothing, aye, nothing shall you be. That is the great fact which you ought to remember. We are the children of the Almighty, we are sparks of the infinite, divine fire. How can we be nothings ? We are everything, ready to do everything, we can do everything, and man must do everything. This faith in themselves was in the hearts of our ancestors, this faith in themselves was the motive power that pushed them forward and forward in the march of civilisation, and if there has been degeneration, if there has been defect, mark my words, you will find that degradation to have started on the day our people lost this faith in themselves. Losing faith in one's self means losing faith in God. Do you believe in that Infinite, good Providence working in and through you ? If you believe that this Omnipresent One, the Antaryamin, is present in every atom, is through and through, Ota-Prota, as the Sanskrit word goes, penetrating your body, mind and soul, how can you lose heart ? I may be a little bubble of water, and you may be a mountain-high wave : never mind ! The infinite ocean is the background of me as well as of you. Mine also is that infinite ocean of life, of power, of spirituality, as well as yours. I am already joined,—from my very birth, from the very fact of my life—I am in Yoga with that infinite life, and infinite goodness, and infinite power, as you are, mountain-high though you may be. Therefore, my brethren, teach this life-saving, great, ennobling, grand doctrine to your children, even from their very birth. You need not teach them Advaitism ; teach them Dvaitism, or any 'ism' you please, but we have seen that this is the common 'ism' all through India : this marvellous doctrine of the soul, the perfection of the soul, is commonly believed in by all sects. As says our great philosopher Kapila, if purity has not been the nature of the soul, it can never attain purity

afterwards, for anything that was not perfect by nature, even if it attained to perfection, that perfection would go away again. If impurity is the nature of man, then man will have to remain impure, even though he may be pure for five minutes. The time will come when this purity will wash out, pass away, and the old natural impurity will have its sway once more. Therefore, say all our philosophers, good is our nature perfection is our nature, not imperfection, not impurity.—and we should remember that. Remember the beautiful example of the great sage who when he was dying, asked his mind to remember all his mighty deeds and all his mighty thoughts. There you do not find that he was teaching his mind to remember all his weaknesses and all his follies. Follies there are, weaknesses there must be, but remember your real nature always,—that is the only way to cure the weaknesses, that is the only way to cure the follies.

It seems that these few points are common among all the various religious sects in India, and perhaps in future upon this common platform, conservative and liberal religionists, old type and new type, may shake hands. Above all, there is another thing to remember, which I am sorry we forget from time to time, that religion, in India, means realisation and nothing short of that. "Believe in the doctrine and you are safe," can never be taught to us, for we do not believe in that ; you are what you make yourselves. You are, by the grace of God and your own exertions, what you are. Mere believing in certain theories and doctrines will not help you much. The mighty word that came out from the sky of spirituality in India was Anubhuti, realisation, and ours are the only books which declare again and again : "The Lord is to be *seen.*" Bold, brave words indeed, but true to their very core ; every sound, every vibration is true. Religion is to be realised, not only heard ; it is not in learning some doctrine like a parrot. Neither is it mere intellectual assent ; that is nothing ; but it must come into us. Aye, and therefore the greatest proof that we have of the existence of a God is not because our reason says so, but because God has been seen by the ancients as well as by the moderns. We believe in the soul not only because there are

good reasons to prove its existence, but, above all, because there have been in the past thousands in India, there are still many who have realised, and there will be thousands in the future who will realise, and see their own souls. And there is no salvation for man until he sees God, realises his own soul. Therefore, above all, let us understand this, and the more we understand it the less we shall have of sectarianism in India, for it is only that man who has realised God and seen Him, who is religious. In him the knots have been cut asunder, in him alone the doubts have subsided ; he alone has become free from the fruits of action, who has seen Him who is nearest of the near and farthest of the far. Aye, we often mistake mere prattle for religious truth, mere intellectual perorations for great spiritual realisation, and then comes sectarianism, then comes fight. If we once understand that this realisation is the only religion, we shall look into our own hearts and find how far we are towards realising the truths of religion. Then we shall understand that we ourselves are groping in darkness, and are leading others to grope in the same darkness, then we shall cease from sectarianism, quarrel and fight. Ask a man who wants to start a sectarian fight, "Have you seen God ? Have you seen the Atman ? If you have not, what right have you to preach His name,—you walking in darkness trying to lead me into the same darkness,—the blind leading the blind, and both falling into the ditch ?"

Therefore, take more thought before you go and find fault with others. Let them follow their own path to realisation so long as they struggle to see truth in their own hearts ; and when the broad, naked truth will be seen, then they will find that wonderful blissfulness which marvellously enough has been testified to by every seer in India, by everyone who has realised the truth. Then words of love alone will come out of that heart, for it has already been touched by Him who is the essence of Love Himself. Then and then alone, all sectarian quarrels will cease, and we shall be in a position to understand, to bring to our hearts, to embrace, to intensely love the very word Hindu, and every one who bears that name. Mark me, then and then alone, you are a Hindu when the very name sends through you a galvanic shock of strength. Then and then

alone, you are a Hindu when every man who bears the name, from any country, speaking our language or any other language, becomes at once the nearest and the dearest to you. Then and then alone, you are a Hindu when the distress of anyone bearing that name comes to your heart and makes you feel as if your own son were in distress. Then and then alone, you are a Hindu when you will be ready to bear everything for them, like the great example I have quoted at the beginning of this lecture, of your great Guru Govind Singh. Driven out from this country, fighting against its oppressors, after having shed his own blood for the defence of the Hindu religion, after having seen his children killed on the battle-field,—aye, this example of the great Guru, left even by those for whose sake he was shedding his blood and the blood of his own nearest and dearest,—he, the wounded lion retired from the field calmly to die in the South, but not a word of curse escaped his lips against those who had ungratefully forsaken him ! Mark me, every one of you will have to be a Govind Singh, if you want to do good to your country. You may see thousands of defects in your countrymen, but mark their Hindu blood. They are the first Gods you will have to worship, even if they do everything to hurt you ; even if everyone of them send out a curse to you you send out to them words of love. If they drive you out, retire to die in silence like that mighty lion, Govind Singh. Such a man is worthy of the name of Hindu ; such an ideal ought to be before us always. All our hatchets let us bury ; send out this grand current of love all round.

Let them talk of India's regeneration as they like ; let me tell you as one who has been working—at least trying to work—all his life, that there is no regeneration for India until you be spiritual. Not only so, but upon it depends the welfare of the whole world. For I must tell you frankly that the very foundations of Western civilisation have been shaken to their base. The mightiest buildings, if built upon the loose sand foundations of materialism, must come to grief one day, must totter to their destruction, some day. The history of the world is our witness. Nation after nation has arisen and based its greatness upon materialism, declaring man was all matter. Aye, in

Western language, a man gives up the ghost, but in our language a man gives up his body. The Western man is a body first, and then he has a soul; with us a man is a soul and spirit, and he has a body. Therein lies a world of different. All such civilisations, therefore, as have been based upon such sand foundations as material comfort and all that, have disappeared one after another, after short lives, from the face of the world; but the civilisation of India and the other nations that have stood at India's feet to listen and learn, namely, Japan and China, live even to the present day, and there are signs even of revival among them. Their lives are like that of the Phoenix, a thousand times destroyed, but ready to spring up again more glorious. But a materialistic civilisation once dashed down, never can come up again; that building once thrown down, is broken into pieces once for all. Therefore have patience and wait, the future is in store for us.

Do not be in a hurry, do not go out to imitate anybody else. This is another great lesson we have to remember; imitation is not civilisation. I may deck myself out in a Raja's dress; but will that make me a Raja? An ass in a lion's skin never makes a lion. Imitation, cowardly imitation, never makes for progress. It is verily the sign of awful degradation in a man. Aye, when a man has begun to hate himself, then the last blow has come When a man has begun to be ashamed of his ancestors, the end has come. Here am I, one of the least of the Hindu race, yet proud of my race, proud of my ancestors. I am proud to call myself a Hindu, I am proud that I am one of your unworthy servants. I am proud that I am a countryman of yours, you the descendants of the sages, you the descendants of the most glorious Rishis the world ever saw. Therefore have faith in yourselves, be proud of your ancestors, instead of being ashamed of them. And do not imitate; do not imitate! Whenever you are under the thumb of others, you lose your own independence. If you are working, even in spiritual things, at the dictation of others, slowly you lose all faculty even of thought. Bring out through your own exertions what you have, but do not imitate, yet take what is good from others. We have to learn from others. You put the seed in the ground, and give it plenty of earth, and air, and water to

feed upon ; when the seed grows into the plant, and into a gigantic tree, does it become the earth, does it become the air, or does it become the water ? It becomes the mighty plant, the mighty tree, after its own nature, having absorbed everything that was given to it. Let that be your position. We have indeed many things to learn from others, yea, that man who refuses to learn is already dead.

Declares our Manu : आददीत परां विद्यां प्रयवादवरदपि । अन्तादपि परं धर्मं स्त्रीरवं लादपि ॥ "Take the jewel of a woman for your wife, though she be of inferior descent. Learn supreme knowledge with service even from the man of low birth ; and even from the Chandala, learn by serving him the way to salvation." Learn everything that is good from others, but bring it in, and in your own way absorb it ; do not become others. Do not be dragged away out of this Indian life ; do not for a moment think that it would be better for India if all the Indians dressed, ate and behaved like another race. You know the difficulty of giving up a habit of a few years. The Lord knows how many thousands of years are in your blood ; this national specialised life has been flowing in one way, the Lord knows for how many thousands of years ; and do you mean to say that that mighty stream, which has nearly reached its ocean, can go back to the snows of its Himalayas again ? That is impossible ! The struggle to do so would only break it Therefore, make way for the life-current of the nation. Take away the blocks that bar the way to the progress of this mighty river, cleanse its path, clear the channel, and out it will rush by its own natural impulse, and the nation will go on careering and progressing.

These are the lines which I beg to suggest to you for spiritual work in India. There are many other great problems which, for want of time, I cannot bring before you this night. For instance, there is the wonderful question of caste. I have been studying this question, its pros and cons, all my life ; I have studied it in nearly every province in India. I have mixed with people of all castes nearly in every part of the country, and I am too bewildered in my own mind to grasp even the

very significance of it. The more I try to study it, the more I get bewildered. Still at last I find that a little glimmer of light is before me, I begin to feel its significance just now. Then there is the other great problem about eating and drinking. That is a great problem indeed. It is not so useless a thing as we generally think. I have come to the conclusion that the insistence which we make now about eating and drinking, is most curious and is just going against what the Shastras required, that is to say, we come to grief by neglecting the proper purity of the food we eat and drink ; we have lost the true spirit of it.

There are several other questions which I want to bring before you, and show how these problems can be solved, how to work out the ideas : but unfortunately the meeting could not come to order until very late, and I do not wish to d.tain you any longer now. I will therefore keep my ideas about caste and other things for a future occasion.

Now, one word more and I will finish about these spiritual ideas. Religion for a long time has come to be statical in India, what we want is to make it dynamical, I want it to be brought into the life of everybody. Religion, as it always has been in the past, must enter the palaces of kings as well as the homes of the poorest peasants in the land. Religion, the common inheritance, the universal birthright of the race, must be brought free to the door of everybody. Religion in India must be made as free and as easy of access as is God's air. And this is the kind of work we have to bring about in India, but not by getting up little sects and fighting on points of difference. Let us preach where we all agree, and leave the difierences to remedy themselves. As I have said to the Indian people again and again, if there is the darkness of centuries in a room, and we go into the room and begin to cry, "Oh, it is dark, it is dark !" will the darkness go ? Bring in the light and the darkness will vanish at once. This is the secret of reforming men. Suggest to them higher things ; believe in man first. Why start with the belief that man is degraded and degenerated ? I have never failed in my faith in man in any case, even taking him at his worst. Wherever I had faith in man, though at first the prospect was not always bright, yet it triumphed in the long

run. Have faith in man, whether he appears to you to be a very learned one or a most ignorant one. Have fath in man, whether he appears to be an angel or the very devil himself. Have faith in man first, and then having faith in him, believe that if there are defects in him, if he makes mistakes, if he embraces the crudest and the vilest doctrines, believe that it is not from his real nature that they come, but from the want to higher ideas. If a man goes towards what is false, it is because he cannot get what is true. Therefore the only method of correcting what is false is by supplying him with what is true. Do this, and let him compare. You give him the truth, and there your work is done. Let him compare it in his own mind with what he has already in him ; and, mark my words, if you have really given him the truth, the false must vanish, light must dispel darkness and truth will bring the good out. This is the way, if you want to reform the country spiritually ; this is the why, and not fighting, not even telling people that what they are doing is bad. Put the good before them, see how eagerly they take it, see how the Divine that never dies, that is always living in the human, comes up awakened and stretches out its hand for all that is good, and all that is glorious.

May He who is the Creator, the Preserver and the Protector of our race, the God of our forefathers, whether called by the name of Vishnu, or Shiva or Shakti, or Ganapati, whether He is worshipped as Saguna or as Nirguna, whether He is worshipped as personal, or as impersonal, may He whom our forefathers knew and addressed by the words—एकं सद्दिपा बहुधा बदन्ति —"That which exists is One ; sages call Him by various names" —may He enter into us with His mighty love, may He shower His blessings on us, may He make us understand each other, may He make us work for each other with real love, with intense love for truth, and may not the least desire for our own personal fame, our own personal prestige, our own personal advantage, enter into this great work of the spiritual regeneration of India !

2

SRI AUROBINDO

[Universally known as Sri Aurobindo, Aurobindo Ghose (1872-1950) is rightly regarded as the prophet of Indian renaissance as well as nationalism. Once a revolutionary belonging to the extremist school, after 1910 he became a great philosopher of Hinduism. Like other Bengali leaders, he condemned the partition of Bengal in very harsh terms. He decried 'Pheroseshahi' or the imitating techniques of the Moderates who regarded British rule as a 'divine dispensation' for the good of India. He appreciated the line of the Extremists who felt that the country was pulsating with a new fervour and hence the time was ripe for ending the helplessness and passivity of the people. He supported the techniques of boycott, swadeshi and passive resistance for the achievement of swaraj. However, his real contribution is to sustain the case of Indian nationalism on spiritual or metaphysical foundations. Taking inspiration from the *Bhagwadgita*, he propoundal the doctrine of 'God-sent leadership' that the hero of any great event is not only a great man but an instrument of God'. Thus as a mystic, he discovered the role of divine force in the shaping of historical events. In this way, his nationalism blended with idealism and universalism. Man has to fulfil himself, and that is possible by fulfilling himself, and this again being possible only through nationality. As J Ramsay MacDonald says : "On this religious conception rests his belief in Swadeshi and his desire to see English predominance in India ended.]

BHAWANI MANDIR*

(OM Namas Chandikayai)

A temple is to be erected and consecrated to Bhawani, the Mother, among the hills. To all the children of the Mother the call is sent forth to help in the sacred work.

Who is Bhawani ? Who is Bhawani, the Mother, and why should we erect a temple to her ?

Bhawani is the Infinite Energy : In the unending revolutions of the world, as the wheel of the Eternal turns mightily in its courses, the Infinite Energy, which streams forth from the Eternal and sets the wheel to work, looms up in the vision of man in various aspects and infinite forms. Each aspect creates and marks an age. Sometimes She is Love, sometimes She is Knowledge, sometimes She is Renunciation, sometimes She is Pity. This Infinite Energy is Bhawani, She also is Durga. She is Kali, She is Radha the Beloved, She is Lakshmi, She is our Mother and the Creatoress of us all.

Bhawani is Shakti : In the present age, the Mother is manifested as the mother of Strength. She is pure Shakti.

The Whole World is Growing Full of the Mother as Shakti : Let us raise our eyes and cast them upon the world around us. Whenever we turn our gaze, huge masses of strength rise before our vision, tremendous, swift and inexorable forces, gigantic figures of energy, terrible sweeping columns of force. All is growing large and strong. The Shakti of war, the Shakti of wealth, the Shakti of Science are tenfold more mighty and colossal, a hundredfold more fierce, rapid and busy in their activity, a thousandfold more prolific in resources, weapons and instruments than ever before in recorded history. Everywhere

*It was written by Sri Aurobindo, but it was more the idea of Barin (Barindra Ghose) than his. It was not meant to train people for assassination as it was for revolutionary preparation of the country. Sri Aurobindo did not espouse this idea, but something of this kind was attempted by Barin in the Manicktala Garden.

the Mother is at work ; from Her mighty and shaping hands enormous forms of Rakshasas, Asuras (demons) and Devas (gods) are leaping forth into the arena of the world. We have seen the slow but mighty rise of great empires in the West, we have seen the swift, irresistible and impetuous bounding into life of Japan. Some are Mlechchha Shaktis, low or (untouchable powers) clouded in their strength, black or blood-crimson with Tamas or Rajas, others are Arya Shaktis (high or good power) bathed in a pure flame of renunciation and utter self-sacrifice : but all are the Mother in Her new phase, remoulding, creating. She is pouring Her spirit into the old ; She is whirling into life the new.

We in India Fail in All Things for Want of Shakti : But in India the breath moves slowly, the afflatus is long in coming. India, the ancient Mother, is indeed striving to be reborn, striving with agony and tears, but she strives in vain. What ails her, she who is after all so vast and might be so strong ? There is surely some enormous defect, something vital is wanting in us, nor is it difficult to lay our finger on the spot. We have all things else, but we are empty of strength, void of energy. We have abandoned Shakti and are therefore abandoned by Shakti. The Mother is not in our hearts, in our brains, in our arms.

The wish to be reborn we have in abundance, there is no deficiency there. How many attempts have been made, how many movements have been begun, in religion, in society, in politics ! But the same fate has overtaken or is preparing to overtake them all. They flourish for a moment, then the impulse wanes, the fire dies out, and if they endure, it is only as empty shells, forms from which the Brahma has gone or in which it lies overpowered with Tamas and inert. Our beginnings are mighty, but they have neither sequel nor fruit.

Now we are beginning in another direction ; we have started a great industrial movement which is to enrich and regenerate an impoverished land. Untaught by experience, we do not perceive that this movement must go the way of all the others,

unless we first seek the one essential thing, unless we acquire strength.

Our Knowledge is a Dead Thing for Want of Shakti : It is knowledge that is wanting ? We Indians, born and bred in a country where Jnana (knowledge) has been stored and accumulated since the race began, bear about in us the inherited gains of many thousands of years. Great giants of knowledge rise among us even today to add to the store Our capacity has not shrunk, the edge of our intellect has not been dulled or blunted, its receptivity and flexibility are as varied as of old. But it is a dead knowledge, a burden under which we are bowed, a poison which is corroding us, rather than as it should be a staff to support our feet and a weapon in our hands ; for this is the nature of all great things that when they are not used or are ill used, they turn upon the bearer and destroy him.

Our knowledge then, weighed down with a heavy load of Tamas, lies under the curse of impotence and inertia. We choose to fancy indeed, nowadays, that if we acquire Science, all will be well. Let us first ask ourselves what we have done with the knowledge we already possess, or what have those who have already acquired Science been able to do for India. Imitative and incapable of initiative, we have striven to copy the methods of England, and we had not the strength ; we would now copy the methods of the Japanese, a still more energetic people ; are we likely to succeed any better ? The mighty force of knowledge which European Science bestows is a weapon for the hands of a giant, it is the mace of Bheemsen ; what can a weakling do with it but crush himself in the attempt to wield it ?

Our Bhakti Cannot Live and Work for Want of Shakti : Is it love, enthusiasm, Bhakti that is wanting ? These are ingrained in the Indian nature, but in the absence of Shakti we cannot concentrate, we cannot direct, we cannot even preserve it. Bhakti (Devotion) is the leaping flame, Shakti (Power) is the fuel. If the fuel is scanty how long can the fire endure ?

When the strong nature, enlightened by knowledge, disciplined and given a giant's strength by Karma, lifts itself up in

love and adoration to God, that is the Bhakti which endures and keeps the soul for ever united with the Divine. But the weak nature is too feeble to bear the impetus of so mighty a thing as perfect Bhakti ; he is lifted up for a moment, then the flame soars up to Heaven, leaving him behind exhausted and even weaker than before. Every movement of any kind of which enthusiasm and adoration are the life must fail and soon burn itself out so long as the human material from which it proceeds is frail and light in substance.

India therefore Needs Shaki Alone : The deeper we look, the more we shall be convinced that the one thing wanting, which we must strive to acquire before all others, is strength—strength physical, strength mental, strength moral, but above all strength spiritual which is the one inexhaustible and imperishable source of all the others. If we have strength, everything else will be added to us easily and naturally. In the absence of strength we are like men in a dream who have hands but cannot seize or strike, who have feet but cannot run.

India, Grown Old and Decrepit in Will, has to be Reborn : Whenever we strive to do anything, after the first rush of enthusiasm is spent a paralysing helplessness seizes upon us. We often see in the cases of old men full of years and experience that the very excess of knowledge seems to have frozen their powers of action and their powers of will. When a great feeling or a great need overtakes them and it is necessary to carry out its promptings in action, they hesitate, ponder, discuss, make tentative efforts and abandon them or wait for the safest and easiest way to suggest itself, instead of taking the most direct ; thus the time when it was possible and necessary to act passes away. Our race has grown just such an old man with stores of knowledge, with ability to feel and desire, but paralysed by senile sluggishness, senile timidity, senile feebleness. If India is to survive, she must be made young again. Rushing and billowing streams of energy must be poured into her ; her soul must become, as it was in the old times, like the surges, vast, puissant, calm or turbulent at will, an ocean of action or of force.

India can be Reborn : Many of us, utterly overcome by Tamas, the dark and heavy demon of inertia, are saying nowadays that it is impossible, that India is decayed, bloodless and lifeless, too weak ever to recover ; that our race is doomed to extinction. It is a foolish and idle saying. No man or nation need be weak unless he chooses, no man or nation need perish unless he deliberately chooses extinction.

What is a Nation ? The Shakti of Its Millions : For what is a nation ? What is our mother-country ? It is not a piece of earth, nor a figure of speech, nor a fiction of the mind. It is a mightly Shakti, composed of the Shaktis of a'l the millions of units that make up the nation, just as Bhawani Mahisha Mardini sprang into being from the Shakti of all the millions of gods assembled in one mass of force and welded into unity. The Shakti we call India, Bhawani Bharati, is the living unity of the Shaktis of three hundred million people ; but she is inactive, imprisoned in the magic circle of Tamas, the self-indulgent inertia and ignorance of her sons. To get rid of Tamas we have but to wake the Brahma within.

It is Our Own Choice whether We Create a Nation or Perish : What is it that so many thousands of holy men, Sadhus and Sannyasis, have preached to us silently by their lives ? What was the message that radiated from the personality of Bhagawan Ramakrishna Paramhansa ? What was is that formed the kernel of the eloquence with which the lion-like heart of Vivekananda sought to shake the world ? It is this, that in every one of these three hundred millions of men, from the Raja on his throne to the coolie at his labour, from the Brahmin absorbed in his Sandhya to the Pariah walking shunned of men, God Liveth. We are all gods and creators, because the energy of God is within us and all life is creation ; not only the making of new forms is creation, but preservation is creation, destruction itself is creation. It rests with us what we shall create ; for we are not, unless we choose, puppets dominated by Fate and Maya ; we are facets and manifestations of Almighty Power.

India must be Reborn, because her Rebirth is Demanded by the Future of the World : India cannot perish, our race cannot

become extinct, because among all the divisions of mankind it is to India that is reserved the highest and the most splendid destiny, the most essential to the future of the human race. It is she who must s nd forth from herself the future religion of the entire world, the Eternal Religion which is to harmonise all religion, science and philosophies and make mankind one soul. In the sphere of morality, likewise, it is her mission to purge barbarism (Mlechchhahood) out of humanity and to Aryanise the world. In order to do this, she must first re-Aryanise herself.

It was to initiate this great work, the greatest and most wonderful work ever given to a race, that Bhagawan Ramakrishna came and Vivekananda preached. If the work does not progress as it once promised to do it is because we have once again allowed the terrible cloud of Tamas to .ettle down on our souls—fear, doubt, hesitation, sluggishness. We have taken, some of us, the Bhakti which poured forth from the one and the Jnana given us by the other, but from lack of Shakti, from the lack of Karma, we have not been able to make our Bhakti a living thing May we yet remember that it was Kali, who is Bhawani, Mother of strength whom Ramakrishna worshipped and with whom he became one.

But the destiny of India will not wait on the falterings and failings of individuals ; the Mother demands that men shall arise to institute Her worship and make it universal.

To Get Strength We must Adore the Mother of Strength : Strength then and again strength and yet more strength is the need of our race. But if it is strength we desire, how shall we gain it if we do not adore the Mother of Strength ? She demands worship not for Her own sake, but in order that She may help us and give Herself to us. This is no fantastic idea, no superstition but the ordinary law of the universe. The gods cannot, if they would, give themselves unasked. Even the Eternal comes out unawares upon men. Every devotee knows by experience that we must turn to Him and desire and adore Him before the Divine Spirit pours in its ineffable

beauty and ecstasy upon the soul. What is true of the Eternal is true also of Her who goes forth from Him.

Religion, the True Path : Those who, possessed with Western ideas, look askance at any return to the old sources of energy, may well consider a few fundamental facts.

The Example of Japan : I. There is no instance in history of a more marvellous and sudden up-surging of strength in a nation than modern Japan. All sorts of theories had been started to account for the uprising, but now the intellectual Japanese are telling us what were the fountains of that mighty awakening, the sources of that inexhaustible strength. They were drawn from religion. It was the Vedantic teachings of Oyomei and the recovery of Shintoism with its worship of the national Shakti of Japan in the image and person of the Mikado that enabled the little island empire to wield the stupendous weapons of Western knowledge and science as lightly and invincibly as Arjun wielded the Gandiv.

India's Greater Need of Spiritual Regeneration : II. India's need of drawing from the fountains of religion is far greater than was ever Japan's ; for the Japanese had only to revitalise and perfect a strength that already existed. We have to create strength where it did not exist before ; we have to change our natures, and become new men with new hearts, to be born again. There is no scientific process, no machinery for that. Strength can only be created by drawing it from the internal and inexhaustible reservoirs of the Spirit, from the Adya-Shakti of the Eternal which is the fountain of all new existence. To be born again means nothing but to revive the Brahma within us, and that is a spiritual process—no effort of the body or the intellect can compass it.

Religion, the Path Natural to the National Mind : III. All great awakenings in India, all her periods of mightiest and most varied vigour have drawn their vitality from the fountain-heads of some deep religious awakening. Wherever the religious awakening has been complete and grand, the ional energy it has created has been gigantic and puissant ; wherever the

religious movement has been narrow or incomplete, the national movement has been broken, imperfect or temporary. The persistence of this phenomenon is proof that it is ingrained in the temperament of the race. If you try other and foreign methods we shall either gain our end with tedious slowness, painfully and imperfectly, or we shall not attain it at all. Why abandon the plain way which God and the Mother have marked out for you, to choose faint and devious paths of your own treading ?

The Spirit within is the True Source of Strength : IV. The Brahma within, the one and indivisible ocean of spiritual force is that from which all life, material and mental, is drawn. This is beginning to be as much recognised by leading Western thinkers as it was from the old days by the East. If it be so, then spiritual energy is the source of all other strength. There are the fathomless fountain-heads, the deep and inexhaustible sources. The shallow surface springs are easier to reach, but they soon run dry. Why not then go deep instead of scratching the surface ? The result will repay the labour.

Three Things Needful : We need three things answering to three fundamental laws.

I. Bhakti—the Temple of the Mother : *We cannot get strength unless we adore the mother of Strength* : We will therefore build a temple to the white Bhawani, the Mother of Strength, the Mother of India ; and we will build it in a place far from the contamination of modern cities and as yet little trodden by man, in a high and pure air steeped in calm and energy. This temple will be the centre from which Her worship is to flow over the whole country ; for there, worshipped among the hills, She will pass like fire into the brains and hearts of Her worshippers. This also is what the Mother has commanded.

II. Karma—A New Order of Brahmacharins : Adoration will be dead and ineffective unless it is transmuted into Karma. We will therefore have a Math with a new Order of Karma Yogins attached to the temple, men who have renounced all in order to work for the Mother. Some may, if they choose, be

complete Sannyasis, most will be Brahmacharins who will return to the Grihasthashram when their allotted work is finished, but all must accept renunciation.

Why? For Reasons : 1. Because it is only in proportion as we put from us the preoccupation of bodily desires and interests, the sensual gratifications, lusts, longings, indolences of the material world, that we can return to the ocean of spiritual force within us.

2. Because for the development of Shakti, entire concentration is necessary ; the mind must be devoted entirely to its aim as a spear is hurled to its mark ; if other cares and longings distract the mind, the spear will be carried out from its straight course and miss the target. We need a nucleus of men in whom the Shakti is developed to its uttermost extent, in whom it fills every corner of the personality and overflows to fertilise the earth. These, having the fire of Bhawani in their hearts and brains, will go forth and carry the flame to every nook and cranny of our land.

III. Jnana—the Great Message : Bhakti and Karma cannot be perfect and enduring unless they are based upon Jnana.

The Brahmacharins of the Order will therefore be taught to fill their souls with knowledge and base their work upon it as upon a rock. What shall be the basis of their knowledge? What but the great *so-aham*, the mighty formula of the Vedanta, the ancient gospel which has yet to reach the heart of the nation, the knowledge which when vivified by Karma and Bhakti delivers man out of all fear and all weakness.

The Message of the Mother : When, therefore, you ask who is Bhawani the Mother, She herself answers you, "I am the Infinite Energy which streams forth from the Eternal in the world and the Eternal in yourselves. I am the Mother of the Universe, the Mother of the Worlds, and for you who are children of the Sacred Land, Aryabhumi, made of her clay and reared by her sun and winds, I am Bhawani Bharati, Mother of India."

Then if you ask why we should erect a temple to Bhawani, the Mother, hear Her answer, "Because I have commanded it, and because by making a centre for the future religion you will be furthering the immediate will of the Eternal and storing up merit which will make you strong in this life and great in another. You will be helping to create a nation, to consolidate an age, to Aryanise a world. And that nation is your own, the age is the age of yourselves and your children, that world is no fragment of land bounded by seas and hills, but the whole earth with her teeming millions."

Come then, hearken to the call of the Mother. She is already in our hearts waiting to manifest Herself, waiting to be worshipped,—inactive because the God in us is concealed by Tamas, troubled by Her inactivity, sorrowful because Her children will not call on Her to help them. You who feel Her stirring within you, fling off the black veil of self, break down the imprisoning walls of indolence, help Her each as you feel impelled, with you-bodies or with your intellect or with your speech or with your wealth or with you-prayers and worship, each man according to his capacity. Draw not back, for against those who were called and heard Her not She may well be wroth in the Day of Her coming; but to those who help Her advent even a little, how radiant with beauty and kindness will be the face of their Mother.

PASSIVE RESISTANCE

Introduction : In a series of articles, published in this paper soon after the Calcutta session of the Congress, we sought to indicate our view both of the ideal which the Congress had adopted, the ideal of Swaraj or Self-Government as it exists in the United Kingdom or the Colonies, and of the possible lines of policy by which that ideal might be attained. There are, we pointed out, only three possible policies : petitioning, an unprecedented way of attempting a nation's liberty, which cannot possibly succeed except under conditions which have not yet existed among human beings ; self-development and self-help ; and the old orthodox historical method of organised resistance

to the existing form of Government. We acknowledge that the policy of self-development which the New Party had forced to the front, was itself a novel departure under the circumstances of modern India. Self-development of an independent nation is one thing; self-development from a state of servitude under an alien and despotic rule without the forcible or peaceful removal of that rule as an indispensable preliminary, is quite another. No national self-development is possible without the support of *raja sakti*, organised political strength, commanding, and whenever necessary compelling general allegiance and obedience. A caste may develop, a particular community may develop, by its own efforts supported by a strong social organisation; a nation cannot. Industrially, socially, educationally, there can be no genuine progress carrying the whole nation forward, unless there is a central force representing either the best thought and energy of the country or else the majority of its citizens and able to enforce the views and decisions of the nation on all its constituent members. Because Japan had such a central authority, she was able in thirty years to face Europe as an equal; because we in India neither had such an authority nor tried to develop it, but supported each tottering step by clinging to the step-motherly apron-strings of a foreign Government, our record of more than seventy years has not been equal to one year of Japan. We have fumbled through the nineteenth century, prattling of enlightenment and national regeneration; and the result has been not national progress, but national confusion and weakness. Individuals here and there might emancipate themselves and come to greatness; particular communities might show a partial and one-sided development, for a time only; but the nation instead of progressing, sank into a very slough of weakness, helplessness and despondency. Political freedom is the life-breath of a nation; to attempt social reform, educational reform, industrial expansion, the moral improvement of the race without aiming first and foremost at political freedom, is the very height of ignorance and futility. Such attempts are foredoomed to disappointment and failure; yet when the disappointment and failure come, we choose to attribute them to some radical defect in the national character; as if the nation were at fault and

not its wise men who would not or could not understand the first elementary conditions of success. The primary requisite for national progress, national reform, is the free habit of free and healthy national thought and action which is impossible in a state of servitude. The second is the organisation of the national will in a strong central authority.

How impossible it is to carry out efficiently any large national object in the absence of this authority was shown by the fate of the Boycott in Bengal. It is idle to disguise from ourselves that the Boycott is not as yet effective except spasmodically and in patches. Yet to carry through the Boycott was a solemn national decision which has not been reversed but rather repeatedly confirmed. Never indeed has the national will been so generally and unmistakably declared ; but for the want of a central authority to work for the necessary conditions, to support by its ubiquitous presence the weak and irresolute and to coerce the refractory, it has not been properly carried out. For the same reason national education languishes. For the same reason every attempt at large national action has failed. It is idle to talk of self-development unless we first evolve a suitable central authority or Government which all will or must accept. The Japanese perceived this at a very early stage and leaving aside all other matters, devoted their first energies to the creation of such an authority in the person of the Mikado and his Government, holding it cheaply purchased even at the price of temporary internal discord and civil slaughter. We also must develop a central authority, which shall be a popular Government in fact though not in name. But Japan was independent ; we have to establish a popular authority which will exist side by side and in rivalry with a despotic foreign bureaucracy—no ordinary rough-riding despotism, but quiet, pervasive and subtle—one that has fastened its grip on every detail of our national life and will not easily be persuaded to let go, even in the least degree, its octopus-like hold. This popular authority will have to dispute every part of our national life and activity, one by one, step by step, with the intruding force to the extreme point of entire emancipation from alien control. This and no less than this is the task before us. A Moderate critic characterised it at the time

as an unheroic programme; but to us it seems so heroic that we frankly acknowledge its novelty and audacity and the uncertainty of success. For success depends on the presence of several very rare conditions. It demands in the first place a country for its field of action in which the people are more powerfully swayed by the fear of social ex-communication and the general censure of their fellows than by the written law. It demands a country where the capacity for extreme self-denial is part of the national character or for centuries has taken a prominent place in the national discipline. These conditions exist in India. But it requires also an iron endurance, tenacity, doggedness, far above anything that is needed for the more usual military revolt or sanguinary revolution. These qualities we have not as yet developed at least in Bengal; but they are easily generated by suffering and necessity and hardened into permanence by a prolonged struggle with superior power. There is nothing like a strong pressure from above to harden and concentrate what lies below—always provided that the superior pressure is not such as to crush the substance on which it is acting. The last requisite therefore for the success of the policy of self-development against the pressure of foreign rule is that the bureaucracy will so far respect its former traditions and professions as not to interfere finally with any course of action of the popular authority which does not itself try violently to subvert the connection of the British Empire with India. It is extremely doubtful whether this last condition will be satisfied. It is easy to see how the bureaucracy might put a summary end to National Education or an effective check on industrial expansion or do away arbitrarily with popular Arbitration Courts. It is easy to see how the temptation to resort to Russian methods on a much larger and effective scale than that of mere Fullerism might prove too strong for a privileged class which felt power slipping from its hold. We therefore said in our previous articles that we must carry on the attempt at self-development as long as we were permitted. What would be our next resource if it were no longer permitted, it is too early to discuss.

The attempt at self-development by self-help is absolutely necessary for our national salvation, whether we can carry it

peacefully to the end or not. In no other way can we get rid of the fatal dependence, passivity and helplessness in which a century of all pervasive British control has confirmed us. To recover the habit of independent motion and independent action is the first necessity. It was for this reason that after extreme provocation and full conviction of the hopelessness otherwise of inducing any change of policy in the older politicians, the leaders of the New school decided to form an independent party and place their views as an independent programme before the country. Their action, though much blamed at the time, has been thoroughly justified by results. The National Congress has not indeed broken with the old petitioning traditions, but it has admitted the new policy as an essential part of the national programme. Swadeshi and National Education have been recognised, and, in all probability, Arbitration will be given its proper prominence at the next session ; Boycott has been admitted as permissible in principle to all parts of India though the recommendation to extend it in practice as an integral part of the national policy was not pressed. It only remained to develop the central authority which will execute the national policy and evolve with time into a popular Government. It was for this object that the New Party determined not to be satisfied with any further evasion of the constitutional question, though they did not press for the adoption of their own particular scheme. It is for this object that a Central National Committee has been formed ; that Conferences are being held in various districts and subdivisions and Committees created ; that the Provincial Conferences are expected to appoint a Provincial Committee for all Bengal. The mere creation of these Committees will not provide us with our central authority, nor will they be really effective for the purpose until the new spirit and the new views are paramount in the whole country. But it is the first step which costs and the first step has been taken.

So far, well ; but the opposition of the bureaucracy to the national self-development must be taken into account. Opposition, not necessarily final and violent, will undoubtedly be offered ; and we have not as yet considered the organisation of any means by which it can be effectually met. Obviously, we

shall have to fall back on the third policy of organised resistance, and have only to decide what form the resistance should take, passive or active, defensive or aggressive. It is well known that the New Party long ago formulated and all Bengal has in theory accepted, the doctrine of passive, or, as it might be more comprehensively termed, defensive resistance. We have therefore not only to organise a central authority, not only to take up all branches of our national life into our hands, but, in order to meet bureaucratic opposition and to compel the alien control to remove its hold on us, if not at once, then tentacle by tentacle we must organise defensive resistance.

Its Object : Organised resistance to an existing form of government may be undertaken either for the vindication of national liberty, or in order to substitute one form of government for another, or to remove particular objectionable features in the existing system without any entire or radical alteration of the whole, or simply for the redress of particular grievances. Our political agitation in the nineteenth century was entirely confined to the smaller and narrower objects. To replace an oppressive land revenue system by the security of a Permanent Settlement, to mitigate executive tyranny by the separation of judicial from executive functions, to diminish the drain on the country naturally resulting from foreign rule by more liberal employment of Indians in the services—to these half-way houses our wise men and political seers directed our steps,—with this limited ideal they confined the rising hopes and imaginations of a mighty people re-awakening after a great downfall Their political inexperience prevented them from realising that these measures on which we have misspent half a century of unavailing effort, were not only paltry and partial in their scope but in their nature ineffective. A Permanent Settlement can always be evaded by a spendthrift Government bent on increasing its resources and unchecked by any system of popular control ; there is no limit to the possible number of cesses and local taxes by which the Settlement could be practically violated without any direct infringement of its provisions. The mere deprivation of judicial function will not disarm executive tyranny so long as both executive and judiciary are mainly white and subservient to a central authority irrespon-

sible, alien and bureaucratic; for the central authority can always tighten its grip on the judiciary of which it is the controller and paymaster and habituate it to a consistent support of executive action. Nor will Simultaneous Examinations and the liberal appointment of Indians mend the matter; for an Englishman serves the Government as a member of the same ruling race and can afford to be occasionally independent; but the Indian civilian is a self masquerading as a heaven-born and can only deserve favour and promotion by his zeal in fastening the yoke heavier upon his fellow-countrymen. As a rule foreign Government can rely on the "native" civilian to be more zealously oppressive than even the average Anglo-Indian official. Neither would the panacea of Simultaneous Examinations really put an end to the burden of the drain. The Congress insistence on the Home Charges for a long time obscured the real accusation against British rule; for it substituted a particular grievance for a radical and congenital evil implied in the very existence of British control. The huge price India has to pay England for the inestimable privilege of being ruled by Englishmen is a small thing compared with the murderous drain by which we purchase the more exquisite privilege of being exploited by British capital. The diminution of Home Charges will not prevent the gradual death by bleeding of which exploitation is the true and abiding cause. Thus, even for the partial objects they were intended to secure, the measures for which we petitioned and clamoured in the last century were hopelessly ineffective. So was it with all the Congress nostrums; they were palliatives which could not even be counted upon to palliate; the radical evil, uncured, would only be driven from one seat in the body politic to take refuge in others where it would soon declare its presence by equally troublesome symptoms. The only true cure for a bad and oppressive financial system is to give the control over taxation to the people whose money pays for the needs of Government. The only effective way of putting an end to executive tyranny is to make the people and not an irresponsible Government the controller and paymaster of both executive and judiciary. The only possible method of stopping the drain is to establish a popular government which may be relied on to foster and

protect Indian commerce and Indian industry conducted by Indian capital and employing Indian labour. This is the object which the new politics, the politics of the twentieth century, places before the people of India in their resistance to the present system of Government,—not tinkering and palliatives but the substitution for the autocratic bureaucracy, which at present misgoverns us, of a free constitutional and democratic system of Government and the entire removal of foreign control in order to make way for perfect national liberty.

The redress of particular grievances and the reformation of particular objectionable features in a system of Government are sufficient objects for organised resistance only when the Government is indigenous and all classes have a recognised place in the political scheme of the State. They are not and cannot be a sufficient object in countries like Russia and India where the laws are made and administered by a handful of men, and a vast population, educated and uneducated alike, have no political right or duty except the duty of obedience and the right to assist in confirming their own servitude. They are still less a sufficient object when the despotic oligarchy is alien by race and has not even a permanent home in the country, for in that case the Government cannot be relied on to look after the general interest of the country, as in nations ruled by indigenous despotism ; on the contrary, they are bound to place the interests of their own country and their own race first and foremost. Organised resistance in subject nations which mean to live and not to die, can have no less an object than an entire and radical change of the system of Government ; only by becoming responsible to the people and drawn from the people can the Government be turned into a protector instead of an oppressor. But if the subject nation desires not a provincial existence and a maimed development but the full, vigorous and noble realisation of its national existence, even a change in the system of Government will not be enough ; it must aim not only at a national Government responsible to the people but a free national Government unhampered even in the least degree by foreign control.

It is not surprising that our politicians of the nineteenth century could not realise these elementary truths of modern politics. They had no national experience behind them of politics under modern conditions; they had no teachers except English books and English liberal "sympathisers" and "friends of India". Schooled by British patrons, trained to the fixed idea of English superiority and Indian inferiority, their imaginations could not embrace the idea of national liberty, and perhaps they did not even desire it at heart, preferring the comfortable ease which at that time still seemed possible in a servitude under British protection, to the struggles and sacrifices of a hard and difficult independence. Taught to take their political lessons solely from the example of England and ignoring or not valuing the historical experience of the rest of the world, they could not even conceive of a truly popular and democratic Government in India except as the slow result of the development of centuries, progress broadening down from precedent to precedent. They could not then understand that the experience of an independent nation is not valid to guide a subject nation, unless and until the subject nation throws off the yoke and itself becomes independent. They could not realise that the slow, painful and ultra-cautious development, necessary in mediaeval and semi-mediaeval conditions when no experience of a stable popular Government had been gained, need not be repeated in the days of the steamship, railway and telegraph, when stable democratic systems are part of the world's secured and permanent heritage. The instructive spectacle of Asiatic nations demanding and receiving constitutional and parliamentary government as the price of a few years' struggle and civil turmoil, had not then been offered to the world. But even if the idea of such happenings had occurred to the more sanguine spirits, they would have been prevented from putting it into words by their inability to discover any means towards its fulfilment. Their whole political outlook was bounded by the lessons of English history, and in English history they found only two methods of politics,—the slow method of agitation and the swift decisive method of open struggle and revolt. Unaccustomed to independent olitical thinking, they did not notice the significant fact that the method of agitation only became

effective in England when the people had already gained a powerful voice in the Government. In order to secure that voice they had been compelled to resort no less than three or several times to the method of open struggle and revolt. Blind to the significance of this fact, our nineteenth century politicians clung to the method of agitation, obstinately hoping against all experience and reason tnat it would somehow serve their purpose. From any idea of open struggle with the bureaucracy they shrank with terror and a sense of paralysis. Dominated by the idea of the overwhelming might of Britain and the object weakness of India, their want of courage and faith in the nation, their rooted distrust of the national character, disbelief in Indian patriotism and blindness to the possibility of true political strength and virtue in the people, precluded them from discovering the rough and narrow way to salvation. Herein lies the superiority of the new school that they have an indomitable courage and faith in the nation and the people. By the strength of that courage and faith they have not only been able to enforce on the mind of the country a higher ideal but perceive an effective means to the realisation of that ideal. By the strength of that courage and faith they have made such immense strides in the course of a few months. By the strength of that courage and faith they will dominate the future.

The new methods were first tried in the great Swadeshi outburst of the last two years,—blindly, crudely, without leading and organisation, but still with amazing results. The moving cause was a particular grievance, the Partition of Bengal ; and to the removal of the particular grievance, pettiest and narrowest of all political objects, our old leaders strove hard to confine the use of this new and mighty weapon. But the popular instinct was true to itself and would have none of it. At a bound we passed therefore from mere particular grievances, however serious and intolerable, to the use of passive resistance as a means of cure for the basest and evilest feature of the present system,—the bleeding to death of a country by foreign exploitation. And from that stage we are steadily advancing, under the guidance of such able political thinking as modern India has not before seen and with the rising

tide of popular opinion at our back, to the one true object of all resistance, passive or active, aggressive or defensive,—the creation of a free popular Government and the vindication of Indian liberty.

Its Necessity : We have defined, so far, the occasion and the ultimate object of the passive resistance we preach. It is the only effective means, except actual armed revolt, by which the organised strength of the nation, gathering to a powerful central authority and guided by the principle of self-development and self-help, can wrest the control of our national life from the grip of an alien bureaucracy, and thus, developing into a free popular Government, naturally replace the bureaucracy it extrudes until the process culminates in a self-governed India, liberated from foreign control. The mere effort at self-development unaided by some kind of resistance, will not materially help us towards our goal. Merely by developing national schools and colleges we shall not induce or force the bureaucracy to give up to us the control of education. Merely by attempting to expand some of our trades and industries, we shall not drive out the British exploiter or take from the British Government its sovereign power of regulating, checking or killing the growth of Swadeshi industries by the imposition of judicious taxes and duties and other methods always open to the controller of a country's finance and legislation. Still less shall we be able by that harmless means to get for ourselves the control of taxation and expenditure. Nor shall we, merely by establishing our own arbitration courts, oblige the alien control to give up the elaborate and lucrative system of Civil and Criminal Judicature which at once emasulates the nation and makes it pay heavily for its own emasculation. In none of these matters is the bureaucracy likely to budge an inch from its secure position unless it is forcibly persuaded. The control of the young mind in its most impressionable period is of vital importance to the continuance of the hypnotic spell by which alone the foreign domination manages to subsist ; the exploitation of the country is the chief reason for its existence ; the control of the judiciary is one of its chief intruments of repression. None of these things can it yield up without bringing itself nearer to its doom. It is only by organised

national resistance, passive or aggressive, that we can make our self development effectual. For if the self-help movement only succeeds in bringing about some modification of educational methods, some readjustment of the balance of trade, some alleviation of the curse of litigation, then, whatever else it may have succeeded in doing, it will have failed of its main object. The new school at least have not advocated the policy of self-development merely out of a disinterested ardour for moral improvement or under the spur of an inoffensive philanthropic patriotism. This attitude they leave to saints and philosophers,—saints like the editor of the *Indian Mirror* or philosophers like the ardent Indian Liberals who sit at the feet of Mr. John Morley. They for their part speak and write frankly as politicians aiming at a definite and urgent political object by a way which shall be reasonably rapid and yet permanent in its results. We may have our own educational theories; but we advocate national education not as an educational experiment or to subserve any theory, but as the only way to secure truly national and patriotic control and discipline for the mind of the country in its malleable youth. We desire industrial expansion, but Swadeshi without boycott, —non-political Swadeshi,—Lord Minto's "honest" Swadeshi —has no attractions for us; since we know that it can bring no safe and permanent national gain;—that can only be secured by the industrial and fiscal independence of the Indian nation. Our immediate problem as a nation is not how to be intellectual and well-informed or how to be rich and industrious, but how to stave off imminent national death, how to put an end to the white peril, how to assert ourselves and live It is for this reason that whatever minor differences there may be between different exponents of the new spirit, they are all agreed on the immediate necessity of an organised national resistance to the state of things which is crushing us out of existence as a nation and on the one goal of that resistance,—freedom.

Organised national resistance to existing conditions, whether directed against the system of Government as such or against some particular feature of it, has three courses open to it. It may attempt to make administration under existing conditions

impossible by an organised passive resistance. This was the policy initiated by the genius of Parnell when by the plan of campaign he prevented the payment of rents in Ireland and by persistent obstruction hampered the transaction of any but Irish business in Westminster. It may attempt to make administration under existing conditions impossible by an organised aggressive resistance in the shape of an untiring and implacable campaign of assassination and a confused welter of riots, strikes and agrarian risings all over the country. This is the spectacle we have all watched with such eager interest in Russia. We have seen the most absolute autocrat and the most powerful and ruthless bureaucracy in the world still in unimpaired possession of all the most effective means of repression, yet beaten to the knees by the determined resistance of an unarmed nation. It has mistakenly been said that the summoning of the Duma was a triumph for passive resistance. But the series of strikes on a gigantic scale which figured so largely in the final stages of the struggle was only one feature of that widespread, desperate and unappeasable anarchy which led to the first triumph of Russian liberty. Against such an anarchy the mightiest and best-organised Government must necessarily feel helpless ; its repression would demand a systematic and prolonged course of massacre on a colossal scale the prospect of which would have paralysed the vigour of the most ruthless and energetic despotism even of mediaeval times. Only by concessions and compromises could such a resistance be overcome. The third course open to an oppressed nation is that of armed revolt, which instead of bringing existing conditions to an end by making their continuance impossible sweeps them bodily out of existence This is the old time-honoured method which the oppressed or enslaved have always adopted by preference in the past, and will adopt in the future if they see any chance of success ; for it is the readiest and swiftest, the most thorough in its results, and demands the least powers of endurance and suffering and the smallest and briefest sacrifices.

The choice by a subject nation of the means it will use for vindicating its liberty, is best determined by the circumstances of its servitude. The present circumstances in India seem to point to passive resistance as our most natural and suitable

weapon. We would not for a moment be understood to base this conclusion upon any condemnation of other methods as in all all circumstances criminal and unjustifiable. It is the common habit of established Governments and especially those which are themselves oppressors, to brand all violent methods in subject peoples and communities as criminal and wicked. When you have disarmed your slaves and legalised the infliction of bonds, stripes and death on any one of them, man, woman or child, who may dare to speak or to act against you, it is natural and convenient to try and lay a moral as well as a legal ban on any attempt to answer violence by violence, the knout by the revolver, the prison by riot or agarian rising, the gallows by the dynamite bomb. But no nation yet has listened to the cant of the oppressor when itself put to the test, and the general conscience of humanity approves the refusal. Under certain circumstances a civil struggle becomes in reality a battle and the morality of war is different from the morality of peace. To shrink from bloodshed and violence under such circumstances is a weakness deserving as severe a rebuke as Sri Krishna addressed to Arjuna when he shrank from the colossal civil slaughter on the field of Kurukshetra. Liberty is the life-breath of a nation ; and when the life is attacked, when it is sought to suppress all chance of breathing by violent pressure, any and every means of self-preservation becomes right and justifiable,—just as it is lawful for a man who is being strangled to rid himself of the pressure on his throat by any means in his power. It is the nature of the pressure which determines the nature of the resistance. Where, as in Russia, the denial of liberty is enforced by legalised murder and outrage, or, as in Ireland formerly, by brutal coercion, the answer of violence to violence is justified and inevitable. Where the need for immediate liberty is urgent and it is a present question of national life or death on the instant, revolt is the only course. But where the oppression is legal and subtle in its methods and respects life, liberty and property and there is still breathing time, the circumstances demand that we should make the experiment of a method of resolute but peaceful resistance which, while less bold and aggressive than other methods, calls for perhaps as much heroism of a kind and certainly more

universal endurance and suffering. In other methods, a daring minority purchase with their blood the freedom of the millions; but for passive resistance it is necessary that all should share in the struggle and the privation.

This peculiar character of passive resistance is one reason why it has found favour with the thinkers of the New Party. There are certain moral qualities necessary to self-government which have become atrophied by long disuse in our people and can only be restored either by the healthy air of a free national life in which alone they can permanently thrive or by their vigorous exercise in the intensity of a national struggle for freedom. If by any possibility the nation can start its career of freedom with a fully developed unity and strength, it will certainly have a better chance of immediate greatness hereafter. Passive resistance affords the best possible training for these qualities. Something also is due to our friends, the enemy. We have ourselves made them reactionary and oppressive and deserved the Government we possess. The reason why even a radical opportunist like Mr. Morley refuses us self-government is not that he does not believe in India's fitness for self-government, but that he does not believe in India's determination to be free; on the contrary, the whole experience of the past shows that we have not been in earnest in our demand for self-government. We should put our determination beyond a doubt and thereby give England a chance of redeeming her ancient promises, made when her rule was still precarious and unstable. For the rest, circumstances still favour the case of passive resistance. In spite of occasional Fullerism, the bureaucracy has not yet made up its mind to a Russian system of repression. It is true that for India also it is now a question of national life or death. Morally and materially she has been brought to the verge of exhaustion and decay by the bureaucratic rule and any further acquiescence in servitude will result in that death-sleep of centuries from which a nation, if it ever awakes at all, awakes emaciated, feeble and unable to resume its true rank in the list of the peoples. But there is still time to try the effect of an united and unflinching pressure of passive resistance. The resistance, if it is to be of any use, must be united and un-

flinching. If from any timidity or selfishness or any mistaken ideas of caution and moderation, our Moderate patriots succeed in breaking the unity and weakening the force of the resistance, the movement will fail and India will sink into those last depths of degradation when only desperate remedies will be of any utility. The advocates of self-development and defensive resistance are no extremists but are trying to give the country its last chance of escaping the necessity of extremism. Defensive resistance is the sole alternative to that ordeal of sanguinary violence on both sides through which all other countries, not excepting the Moderates' exemplar England, have been compelled to pass, only at last "embracing Liberty over a heap of corpses".

Its Methods : The essential difference between passive or defensive and active or aggressive resistance is this, that while the method of the aggressive resister is to do something by which he can bring about positive harm to the Government, the method of the passive resister is to abstain from doing something by which he would be helping the Government. The object in both cases is the same,—to force the hands of the Government ; the line of attack is different. The passive method is especially suitable to countries where the Government depends mainly for the continuance of its administration on the voluntary help and acquiescence of the subject people. The first principle of passive resistance, therefore, which the new school have placed in the forefront of their programme, is to make administration under present conditions impossible by an organised refusal to do anything which shall help either British commerce in the exploitation of the country or British officialdom in the administration of it,—unless and until the conditions are changed in the manner and to the extent demanded by the people. This attitude is summed up in the one word, Boycott. If we consider the various departments of the administration one by one, we can easily see how administration in each can be rendered impossible by successfully organised refusal of assistance. We are dissatisfied with the fiscal and economical conditions of British rule in India, with the foreign exploitation of the country, the continual bleeding

of its resources, the chronic famine and rapid impoverishment which result, the refusal of the Government to protect the people and their industries. Accordingly, we refuse to help the process of exploitation and impoverishment in our capacity as consumers, we refuse henceforth to purchase foreign and especially British goods or to condone their purchase by others. By an organised and relentless boycott of British goods, we propose to render the further exploitation of the country impossible. We are dissatisfied also with the conditions under which education is imparted in this country, its calculated poverty and insufficiency, its anti-national character, its subordination to the Government and the use made of that subordination for the discouragement of patriotism and the inculcation of loyalty. Accordingly we refuse to send our boys to Government schools or to schools aided and controlled by the Government; if this educational boycott is general and well-organised, the educational administration of the country will be rendered impossible and the control of its youthful minds pass out of the hands of the foreigner. We are dissatisfied with the administration of justice, the ruinous costliness of the civil side, the brutal rigour of its criminal penalties and procedure, its partiality, its frequent subordination to political objects. We refuse accordingly to have any resort to the alien courts of justice, and by an organised judicial boycott propose to make the bureaucratic administration of justice impossible while these conditions continue. Finally, we disapprove of the executive administration, its arbitrariness, its meddling and inquisitorial character, its thoroughness of repression, its misuse of the police for the repression instead of the protection of the people. We refuse, accordingly, to go to the executive for help or advice or protection or to tolerate any paternal interference in our public activities, and by an organised boycott of the executive propose to reduce executive control and interference to a mere skeleton of its former self. The bureaucracy depends for the success of its administration on the help of the few and the acquiescence of the many. If the few refused to help, if Indians no longer consented to teach in Government schools or work in Government offices, or serve the alien as police, the administration could not continue for a day. We

will suppose the bureaucracy able to fill their places by Eurasians, aliens or traitors ; even then the refusal of the many to acquiesce, by the simple process of no longer resorting to Government schools, courts of justice or magistrates' Katcherries, would put an end to administration.

Such is the nature of passive resistance as preached by the new school in India. It is at once clear that self-development and such a scheme of passive resistance are supplementary and necessary to each other. If we refuse to supply our needs from foreign sources, we must obviously supply them ourselves; we cannot have the industrial boycott without Swadeshi and the expansion of indigenous industries. If we decline to enter the alien courts of justice, we must have arbitration courts of our own to settle our disputes and differences. If we do not send our boys to schools owned or controlled by the Government, we must have schools of our own in which they may receive a thorough and national education. If we do not go for protection to the executive, we must have a system of self-protection and mutual protection of our own. Just as Swadeshi is the natural accompaniment of an industrial boycott, so also arbitration stands in the same relation to a judicial boycott, national education to an educational boycott, a league of mutual defence to an executive boycott. From this close union of self-help with passive resistance it also follows that the new politics do not contemplate the organisation of passive resistance as a temporary measure for partial ends. It is not to be dropped as soon as the Government undertakes the protection of indigenous industries, reforms its system of education, improves its courts of justice and moderates its executive rigour and ubiquity, but only when the control of all these functions is vested in a free, constitutional and popular Government. We have learned by bitter experience that an alien and irresponsible bureaucracy cannot be relied upon to abstain from rescinding its reforms when convenient or to manage even a reformed administration in the interests of the people.

The possibilities of passive resistance are not exhausted by the refusal of assistance to the administration. In Europe its more usual weapon is the refusal to pay taxes. The strenuous

political instinct of European races teaches them to aim a direct blow at the most vital part of the administration rather than to undermine it by slower and more gradual means. The payment of taxes is the most direct assistance given by the community to the administration and the most visible symbol of acquiescence and approval. To refuse payment is at once the most emphatic protest possible short of taking up arms, and the sort of attack which the administration will feel immediately and keenly and must therefore partly at once either by conciliation or by methods of repression which will give greater vitality and intensity to the opposition. The refusal to pay taxes is a natural and logical result of the attitude of passive resistance. A boycott of Government schools, for example, may be successful and national schools substituted ; but the administration continues to exact from the people a certain amount of revenue for the purposes of education, and is not likely to relinquish its claims ; the people will therefore have doubly to tax themselves in order to maintain national education and also to maintain the Government system by which they no longer profit. Under such circumstances the refusal to pay for an education of which they entirely disapprove, comes as a natural consequence. This was the form of resistance offered by the Dissenters in England to the Education Act of the last Conservative Government. The refusal to pay rents was the backbone of the Irish Plan of Campaign. The refusal to pay taxes levied by an Imperial Government in which they had no voice or share, was the last form of resistance offered by the American Colonists previous to taking up arms. Ultimately, in case of the persistent refusal of the administration to listen to reason, the refusal to pay taxes is the strongest and final form of passive resistance.

This stronger sort of passive resistance has not been included by the new party in its immediate programme, and for valid reasons. In the first place, all the precedents for this form of resistance were accompanied by certain conditions which do not as yet obtain in India. In the Irish instance, the refusal was not to pay Government taxes but to pay rents to a landlord class who represented an unjust and impoverishing land system maintained in force by a foreign power against the

wishes of the people ; but in India the foreign bureaucracy has usurped the functions of the landlord, except in Bengal where a refusal to pay rents would injure not a landlord-class supported by the alien but a section of our own countrymen who have been intolerably harassed, depressed and burdened by bureaucratic policy and bureaucratic exactions and fully sympathise, for the most part, with the national movement. In all other parts of India the refusal to pay rents would be a refusal to pay a overnment tax. This, as we have said, is the strongest, the final form of passive resistance, and differs from the method of political boycott which involves no breach of legal obligation or direct defiance of administrative authority. No man can be legally punished for using none but Swadeshi articles or persuading others to follow his example or for sending his boys to a National in preference to a Government school, or for settling his differences with others out of court, or for defending his person and property or helping to defend the person and property of his neighbours against criminal attack. If the administration interferes with the people in the exercise of these legitimate rights, it invites and compels defiance of its authority and for what may follow, the rulers and not the people are responsible. But the refusal to pay taxes is a breach of legal obligation and a direct defiance of administrative authority precisely of that kind which the administration can least afford to neglect and must either conciliate or crush. In a free country, the attempt at repression would probably go no farther than the forcible collection of the payments refused by legal distraint ; but in a subject country the bureaucracy, feeling itself vitally threatened, would naturally supplement this legal process by determined prosecution and persecution of the advocates of the policy and its adherents, and, in all probability, by extreme military and police violence. The refusal to pay taxes would, therefore, inevitably bring about the last desperate struggle between the forces of national aspiration and alien repression. It would be in the nature of an ultimatum from the people to the Government.

The case of the English Dissenters, although it was a refusal to pay taxes, differed materially from ours. The object of their passive resistance was not to bring the Government to its knees,

but to generate so strong a feeling in the country that the Conservative Government would be ignominiously brushed out of office at the next elections. They had the all-powerful weapon of the vote and could meet and overthrow injustice at the polling station. In India we are very differently circumstanced. The resistance of the American colonists offers a nearer parallel. Like ourselves the Americans met oppression with the weapon of boycott. They were not wholly dependent on England and had their own legislatures in local affairs ; so they had no occasion to extend the boycott to all departments of national life nor to attempt a general policy of national self-development. Their boycott was limited to British goods. They had however to go beyond the boycott and refuse to pay the taxes imposed on them against their will ; but when they offered the ultimatum to the mother country ; they were prepared to follow it up, if necessary, and did finally follow it up by a declaration of independence, supported by armed revolt. Here again there is a material difference from Indian conditions. An ultimatum should never be presented unless one is prepared to follow it up to its last consequences. Moreover, in a vast country like India, any such general conflict with dominant authority as is involved in a no-taxes policy, needs for its success a close organisation linking province to province and district to district and a powerful central authority representing the single will of the whole nation which could alone fight on equal terms the final struggle of defensive resistance with bureaucratic repression. Such an organisation and authority has not yet been developed. The new politics, therefore, confines itself for the time to the policy of lawful abstention from any kind of co-operation with the Government,—the policy of boycott which is capable of gradual extension, leaving to the bureaucracy the onus of forcing on a more direct, sudden and dangerous struggle. Its principle at present is not "no repre sentation, no taxation," but "no control, no assistance".

Its obligations : In the early days of the new movement it was declared, in a very catching phrase, by a politician who has now turned his back on the doctrine which made him famous, that a subject nation has no politics. And it was commonly said that we as a subject nation should altogether

ignore the Government and turn our attention to emancipation by self-help and self-development. This was the self-development principle carried to its extreme conclusions, and it is not surprising that phrases so trenchant and absolute should have given rise to some misunderstanding. It was even charged against us by Sir Pherozeshah Mehta and other robust exponents of the opposition cum cooperation theory that we were advocating non-resistance and submission to political wrong and injustice ! Much water has flowed under the bridges since then, and now we are being charged, in deputations to the Viceroy and elsewhere, with the opposite offence of inflaming and fomenting disturbance and rebellion. Yet our policy remains essentially the same,—not to ignore such a patent and very troublesome fact as the alien bureaucracy, for that was never our policy,—but to have nothing to do with it, in the way either of assistance or acquiescence. Far from preaching non-resistance, it has now become abundantly clear that our determination not to submit to political wrong and injustice was far deeper and sterner than that of our critics. The method of opposition differed, of course. The Moderate method of resistance was verbal only—prayer, petition and protest ; the method as proposed was practical,—boycott. But, as we have pointed out, our new method, though more concrete, was in itself quite as legal and peaceful as the old. It is no offence by law to abstain from Government schools or Government courts or justice or the help and protection of the fatherly executive or the use of British goods ; nor is it illegal to persuade others to join in our abstention.

At the same time this legality is neither in itself an essential condition of passive resistance generally, nor can we count upon its continuance as an actual condition of passive resistance as it is to be understood and practised in India. The passive resister in other countries has always been prepared to break an unjust and oppressive law whenever necessary and to take the legal consequences, as the non-Conformists in England did when they refused to pay the education rate, or as Hampden did when he refused to pay ship-money. Even under present conditions in India there is at least one direction in which, it appears, many of us are already breaking what

Anglo-Indian courts have determined to be the law. The law relating to sedition and the law relating to the offence of causing racial enmity are so admirably vague in their terms that there is nothing which can escape from their capacious embrace. It appears from the *Punjabee* case that it is a crime under bureaucratic rule to say that Europeans hold Indian life cheaply, although this is a fact which case after case has proved, and although British justice has confirmed this cheap valuation of our lives by the leniency of its sentences on European murderers ; nay, it is a crime to impute such failings to British justice or to say even that departmental enquiries into "accidents" of this kind cannot be trusted, although this is a conviction in which, as everyone is aware, the whole country is practically unanimous as the result of repeated experiences. All this is not crime indeed when we do it in order to draw the attention of the bureaucracy in the vain hope of getting the grievance redressed. But if our motive is to draw the attention of the people and enlighten them on the actual and inevitable results of irresponsible rule by aliens and the dominance of a single community, we are criminals, we are guilty of breaking the law of the alien. Yet to break the law in this respect is the duty of every self-respecting publicist who is of our way of thinking. It is our duty to drive home to the public mind the congenital and incurable evils of the present system of Government, so that they may insist on its being swept away in order to make room for a more healthy and natural state of things. It is our duty also to press upon the people the hopelessness of appealing to the bureaucracy to reform itself and the uselessness of any partial measures. No publicist of the new school holding such views ought to mar his reputation for candour and honesty by the pretence of drawing the attention of the Government with a view to redress the grievance. If the alien laws have declared it illegal for him to do his duty, unless he lowers himself by covering it with a futile and obvious lie, he must still do his duty, however illegal, in the strength of his manhood ; and if the bureaucracy decide to send him to prison for the breach of law, to prison he must willingly and, if he is worth his salt, rejoicingly go. The new spirit will not suffer any individual aspiring to speak or act on behalf of the

people to palter with the obligation of high truthfulness and unflinching courage without which no one has a claim to lead or instruct his fellow-countrymen.

If this penalty of sedition is at present the chief danger which the adherent or exponent of passive resistance runs under the law, yet there is no surety that it will continue to be unaccompanied by similar or more serious perils. The making of the laws is at present in the hands of our political adversaries and there is nothing to prevent them from using this power in any way they like, however iniquitous or tyrannical,—nothing except their fear of public reprobation outside and national resistance within India. At present they hope by the seductive allurements of Morleyism to smother the infant strength of the national spirit in its cradle ; but as that hope is dissipated and the doctrine of passive resistance takes more and more concrete and organised form, the temptation to use the enormously powerful weapon which the unhampered facility of legislation puts in their hands, will become irresistible. The passive resister must therefore take up his creed with the certainly of having to suffer for it. If, for instance, the bureaucracy should make abstention from Government schools or teaching without Government licence a penal offence, he must continue to abstain or teach and take the legal consequences. Or if they forbid the action of arbitration courts other than those sanctioned by Government, he must yet continue to act on such courts or have recourse to them without considering the peril to which he exposes himself. And so throughout the whole range of action covered by the new politics. A law imposed by a people on itself has a binding force which cannot be ignored except under extreme necessity ; a law imposed from outside has no such moral sanction ; its claim to obedience must rest on coercive force or on its own equitable and beneficial character and not on the source from which it proceeds. If it is unjust and oppressive, it may become a duty to disobey it and quietly endure the punishment which the law has provided for its violation. For passive resistance aims at making a law unworkable by general and organised disobedience and so procuring its recall ; it does not try, like aggressive resistance, to destroy the law by destroying

the power which made and supports the law. It is therefore the first canon of passive resistance that to break an unjust coercive law is not only justifiable but, under given circumstances, a duty.

Legislation, however, is not the only weapon in the hands of the bureaucracy. They may try, without legislation, by executive action, to bring opposition under the terms of the law and the lash of its penalties. This may be done either by twisting a perfectly legal act into a criminal offence or misdemeanour with the aid of the ready perjuries of the police or by executive order or ukase making illegal an action which had previously been allowed. We have had plenty of experience of both these contrivances during the course of the Swadeshi movement. To persuade an intending purchaser not to buy British cloth is no offence ; but if, between a police employed to put down Swadeshi and a shopkeeper injured by it, enough evidence can be concocted to twist persuasion into compulsion, the boycotter can easily be punished without having committed any offence. Executive orders are an even more easily-handled weapon. The issuing of an ukase asks for no more trouble than the penning of a few lines by a clerk and the more or less illegible signature of a District Magistrate ; and hey-presto ! that brief magical abracadabra of despotism has turned an action, which five minutes ago was legitimate and inoffensive into a crime or misdemeanour punishable in property or person. Whether it is the simple utterance of 'Bande Mataram' in the streets or an august assemblage of all that is most distinguished, able and respected in the country, one stroke of a mere District Magistrate's omnipotent pen is enough to make them illegalities and turn the elect of the nation into disorderly and riotous Budmashes to be dispersed by police cudgels. To hope for any legal redress is futile ; for the power of the executive to issue ukases is perfectly vague and therefore practically illimitable, and wherever there is a doubt, it can be brought within the one all-sufficient formula,—"It was done by the Magistrate in exercise of the discretion given him for preserving the peace." The formula can cover any ukase or any action, however arbitrary : and what British Judge can refuse his support to a British Magistrate in that preservation of

peace which is as necessary to the authority and safety of the Judge as to that of the Magistrate ? But equally is it impossible for the representatives of popular aspirations to submit to such paralysing exercise of an irresponsible and unlimited authority. This has been universally recognised in Bengal. Executive authority was defined by all Bengal when its representatives, with Babu Surendranath Banerji at their head, escorted their President through the streets of Barisal with the forbidden cry of 'Bande Mataram'. If the dispersal of the Conference was not resisted, it was not from respect for executive authority but purely for reasons of political strategy. Immediately afterwards the right of public meeting was asserted in defiance of executive ukase by the Moderate leaders near Barisal itself and by prominent politicians of the new school in East Bengal. The second canon of the doctrine of passive resistance has therefore been accepted by politicians of both schools—that to resist an unjust coercive order to interference is not only justifiable but, under given circumstances, a duty.

Finally, we must be prepared for opposition not only from our natural but from unnatural adversaries,—not only from bureaucrat and Anglo-Indian, but from the more self-seeking and treacherous of our own countrymen. In a rebellion such treachery is of small importance, since in the end it is the superior fate or the superior force which triumphs ; but in a campaign of passive resistance the evil example, if unpunished, may be disastrous and eat fatally into the enthusiastic passion and serried unity indispensable to such a movement. It is therefore necessary to mete out the heaviest penalty open to us in such cases—the penalty of social excommunication. We are not in favour of this weapon being lightly used ; but its employment, where the national will in a vital matter is deliberately disregarded, becomes essential. Such disregard amounts to siding in matters of life and death against your own country and people and helping in their destruction or enslavement,—a crime which in Free States is punished with the extreme penalty due to treason. When, for instance, all Bengal staked its future upon the Boycott and specified three foreign articles,—salt, sugar and cloth,—as to be religiously avoided, anyone purchasing foreign salt or foreign sugar or foreign cloth

became guilty of treason to the nation and laid himself open to the penalty of social boycott. Wherever passive resistance has been accepted, the necessity of the social boycott has been recognised as its natural concomitant. "Boycott foreign goods and boycott those who use foreign goods,"—the advice of Mr. Subramaniya Aiyar to his countrymen in Madras,—must be accepted by all who are in earnest. For without this boycott of persons the boycott of things cannot be effective; without the social boycott no national authority depending purely on moral pressure can get its decress effectively executed; and without effective boycott enforced by a strong national authority the new policy cannot succeed. But the only possible alternatives to the new policy are either despotism tempered by petitions or aggressive resistance. We must therefore admit a third canon of the doctrine of passive resistance, that social boycott is legitimate and indispensable as against persons guilty of treason to the nation.

Its Limits: The three canons of the doctrine of passive resistance are in reality three necessities which must, whether we like it or not, be accepted in theory and executed in practice, if passive resistance is to have any chance of success. Passive resisters, both as individuals and in the mass, must always be prepared to break an unjust coercive law and take the legal consequence; for if they shrink from this obligation, the bureaucracy can at once make passive resistance impossible simply by adding a few more enactments to their book of statutes. A resistance which can so easily be snuffed out of being is not worth making. For the same reason they must be prepared to disobey an unjust and coercive executive order whether general or particular; for nothing would be simpler than to put down by a few months' coercion a resistance too weak to face the consequences of refusing submission to Government by ukase. They must be prepared to boycott persons guilty of deliberate disobedience to the national will in vital matters because, if they do not, the example of unpunished treason will tend to be repeated and destroy by a kind of dry rot the enthusiastic unity and universality which we have seen to be necessary to the success of passive resistance of the kind we have inaugurated in India. Men in the mass are strong

and capable of wonder-working enthusiasms and irresistible movements ; but the individual average man is apt to be weak or selfish and, unless he sees that the mass are in deadly earnest and will not tolerate individual treachery, he will usually, after the first enthusiasm, indulge his weakness or selfishness to the detriment of the community. We have seen this happening almost everywhere where the boycott of foreign goods was not enforced by the boycott of persons buying foreign goods. This is one important reason why the boycott which has maintained itself in East Bengal, is in the West becoming more and more of a failure.

The moment these three unavoidable obligations are put into force, the passive resistance movement will lose its character of inoffensive legality and we shall be in the thick of a struggle which may lead us anywhere. Passive resistance, when it is confined—as at present—to lawful abstention from actions which it lies within our choice as subjects to do or not to do, is of the nature of the strategical movements and large manoeuvrings previous to the meeting of armies in the field ; but the enforcement of our three canons brings us to the actual shock of battle. Nevertheless our resistance still retains an essential character of passivity. If the right of public meeting is suspended by Magisterial ukase, we confine ourselves to the practical assertion of the right in defiance of the ukase and, so long as the executive also confines itself to the dispersal of the meeting by the arrest of its conveners and other peaceful and legal measures, we offer no active resistance. We submit to the arrest, though not necessarily to the dispersal, and quietly take the legal consequences. Similarly, if the law forbids us to speak or write the truth as we conceive it our duty to speak it, we persist in doing our duty and submit quietly to whatever punishment the law of sedition or any other law coercive ingenuity may devise, can find to inflict on us. In a peaceful way we act against the law or the executive, but we passively accept the legal consequences.

There is a limit however to passive resistance. So long as the action of the executive is peaceful and within the rules of the fight, the passive resister scrupulously maintains his

attitude of passivity, but he is not bound to do so a moment beyond. To submit to illegal or violent methods of coercion, to accept outrage and hooliganism as part of the legal procedure of the country is to be guilty of cowardice, and, by dwarfing national manhood, to sin against the divinity within ourselves and the divinity in our motherland. The moment coercion of this kind is attempted, passive resistance ceases and active resistance becomes a duty. If the instruments of the executive choose to disperse our meeting by breaking the heads of those present, the right of self-defence entitles us not merely to defend our heads but to retaliate on those of the head-breakers. For the myrmidons of the law have ceased then to be guardians of the peace and become breakers of the peace, rioters and not instruments of authority, and their uniform is no longer a bar to the right of self-defence. Nor does it make any difference if the instruments of coercion happen to be the recognised and usual instruments or are unofficial hooligans in alliance or sympathy with the forces of coercion. In both cases active resistance becomes a duty and passive resistance is, for that occasion, suspended. But through no longer passive, it is still a defensive resistance. Nor does resistance pass into the aggressive stage so long as it resists coercive violence in its own kind and confines itself to repelling attack. Even if it takes the offensive, it does not by that mere fact become aggressive resistance, unless the amount of aggression exceeds what is necessary to make defence effective. The students of Mymensingh, charged by the police while picketing, kept well within the right of self-defence when they drove the rioters off the field of operations; the gentlemen of Comilla kept well within the rights of self-defence if they attacked either rioters or inciters of riot who either offered, or threatened, or tried to provoke assault. Even the famous shot which woke the authorities from their waking dreams, need not have been an act of aggression if it was fired to save life or a woman's honour or under circumstances of desperation when no other means of defence would have been effective. With the doubtful exception of this shot, supposing it to have been fired unnecessarily, and that other revolver shot which killed Mr. Rand, there has been no instance of aggressive resistance in modern Indian politics.

The new politics, therefore, while it favours passive resistance, does not include meek submission to illegal outrage under that term; it has no intention of overstressing the passivity at the expense of the resistance. Nor is it inclined to be hysterical over a few dozen of broken heads or exalt so simple a matter as a bloody coxcomb into the crown of martyrdom. This sort of hysterical exaggeration was too common in the early days of the movement when everyone who got his crown cracked in a street affray with the police was encouraged to lift up his broken head before the world and cry out, "This is the head of a martyr." The new politics is a serious doctrine and not, like the old, a thing of shows and political theatricals; it demands real sufferings from its adherents,—imprisonment, worldly ruin, death itself, before it can allow him to assume the rank of a martyr for his country. Passive resistance cannot build up a strong and great nation unless it is masculine, bold and ardent in its spirit and ready at any moment and at the slightest notice to supplement itself with active resistance. We do not want to develop a nation of women who know only how to suffer and not how to strike.

Morever, the new politics must recognise the fact that beyond a certain point passive resistance puts a strain on human endurance which our natures cannot endure. This may come in particular instances where an outrage is too great or the stress of tyranny too unendurable for anyone to stand purely on the defensive; to hit back, to assail and crush the assailant, to vindicate one's manhood becomes an imperious necessity to outraged humanity. Or it may come in the mass when the strain of oppression a whole nation has to meet in its unarmed struggle for liberty, overpasses its powers of endurance. It then becomes the sole choice either to break under the strain and go under or to throw it off with violence. The Spartan soldiers at Plataea endured for some time the missiles of the enemy and saw their comrades falling at their side without any reply because their general had not yet declared it to be the auspicious time for attack; but if the demand on their passive endurance had been too long continued, they mu either have broken in disastrous defeat or flung themselves on the enemy in

disregard of their leader's orders. The school of politics which we advocate is not based upon abstractions, formulas and dogmas, but on practical necessities and the teaching of political experience, common sense and the world's history. We have not the slightest wish to put forward passive resistance as an inelastic dogma. We preach defence resistance mainly passive in its methods at present, but active whenever active resistance is needed ; but defensive resistance within the limits imposed by human nature and by the demands of self-respect and the militant spirit of true manhood. If at any time the laws obtaining in India or the executive action of the bureaucracy were to become so oppressive as to render a struggle for liberty on the lines we have indicated, impossible ; if after a fair trial given to this method, the object with which we undertook it, proved to be as far off as ever ; or if passive resistance should turn out either not feasible or necessarily ineffectual under the conditions of this country, we should be the first to recognise that everything must be reconsidered and that the time for new men and new methods had arrived. We recognise no political object of worship except the divinity in our Motherland, no present object of political endeavour except liberty, and no method or action as politically good or evil except as it truly helps or hinders our progress towards national emancipation.

Conclusions : To sum up the conclusions at which we have arrived. The object of all our political movements and therefore the sole object with which we advocate passive resistance is Swaraj or national freedom. The latest and most venerable of the older politicians who have sat in the Presidential Chair of the Congress, pronounced from that seat of authority Swaraj as the one object of our political endeavour,—Swaraj as the only remedy for all our ills,—Swaraj as the one demand nothing short of which will satisfy the people of India. Complete self-government as it exists in the United Kingdom or the Colonies, —such was his definition of Swaraj. The Congress has contented itself with demanding self-government as it exists in the Colonies. We of the new school would not pitch our ideal one inch lower than absolute Swaraj,—self-government as it exists in the United Kingdom. We believe that no smaller ideal can

inspire national revival or nerve the people of India for the fierce, stubborn and formidable struggle by which alone they can again become a nation. We believe that this newly awakened people, when it has gathered its strength together, neither can nor ought to consent to any relations with England less than that of equals in a confederacy. To be content with the relations of master and dependent or superior and subordinate, would be a mean and pitiful aspiration unworthy of manhood; to strive for anything less than a strong and glorious freedom would be to insult the greatness of our past and the magnificent possibilities of our future.

To the ideal we have at heart there are three paths, possible or impossible. Petitioning, which we have so long followed, we reject as impossible,—the dream of a timid inexperience, the teaching of false friends who hope to keep us in perpetual subjection, foolish to reason, false to experience. Self-development by self help which we now propose to follow, is a possible though uncertain path, never yet attempted under such difficulties, but one which must be attempted, if for nothing else yet to get free of the habit of dependence and helplessness, and re awaken and exercise our half-atrophied powers of self-government. Parallel to this attempt and to be practised simultaneously, the policy of organised resistance to the present system of government forms the old traditional way of nations which we also must tread. It is a vain dream to suppose that what other nations have won by struggle and battle, by suffering and tears of blood, we shall be allowed to accomplish easily, without terrible sacrifices. merely by spending the ink of the journalist and petition-framer and the breath of the orator. Petitioning will not bring us one yard nearer to freedom ; self-development will not easily be suffered to advance to its goal. For self-development spells the doom of the ruling bureaucratic despotism, which must therefore oppose our progress with all the art and force of which it is the master ; without organised resistance we could not take more than a few faltering steps towards self-emancipation. But resistance may be of many kinds,—armed revolt, or aggressive resistance short of armed revolt, or defensive resistance whether passive or active ; the circumstances of the country and the nature of the despo-

tism from which it seeks to escape must determine what form of resistance is best justified and most likely to be effective at the time or finally successful.

The Congress has not formally abandoned the petitioning policy ; but it is beginning to fall into discredit and gradual disuse, and time will accelerate its inevitable death by atrophy ; for it can no longer even carry the little weight it had, since it has no longer the support of an undivided public opinion at its back. The alternative policy of self-development has received a partial recognition ; it has been made an integral part of our political activities, but not in its entirety and purity. Self-help has been accepted as supplementary to the help of the very bureaucracy which it is our declared object to undermine and supplant,—self-development as supplementary to development of the nation by its foreign rulers. Passive resistance has not been accepted as a national policy, but in the form of Boycott it has been declared legitimate under circumstances which apply to all India.

This is a compromise good enough for the moment but in which the new school does not mean to allow the country to rest permanently. We desire to put an end to petitioning until such a strength is created in the country that a petition will only be a courteous form of demand. We wish to kill utterly the pernicious delusion that a foreign and adverse interest can be trusted to develop us to its own detriment, and entirely to do away with the foolish and ignoble hankering after help from our natural adversaries. Our attitude to bureaucratic concession is that of Laocoon : "We fear the Greeks even when they bring us gifts." Our policy is self-development and defensive resistance. But we would extend the policy of self development to every department of national life ; not only Swadeshi and National Education, but national defence, national arbitration courts, sanitation, insurance against famine or relief of famine, —whatever our hands find to do or urgently needs doing, we must attempt ourselves and no longer look to the alien to do it for us. And we would universalise and extend the policy of defensive resistance until it ran parallel on ev ry line with our self-development. We would not only buy our own goods, but boycott British goods ; not only have our own schools, but

boycott Government institutions; not only erect our own Arbitration Courts, but boycott bureaucratic justice; not only organise our league of defence, but have nothing to do with the bureaucratic Executive except when we cannot avoid it. At present even in Bengal where Boycott is universally accepted, it is confined to the boycott of British goods and is aimed at the British merchant and only indirectly at the British bureaucrat. We would aim it directly both at the British merchant and at the British bureaucrat who stands behind and makes possible exploitation by the merchant.

The double policy we propose has three objects before it :— to develop ourselves into a self-governing nation; to protect ourselves against and repel attack and opposition during the work of development; and to press in upon and extrude the foreign agency in each field of activity and so ultimately supplant it. Our defensive resistance must therefore be mainly passive in the beginning, although with a perpetual readiness to supplement it with active resistance whenever compelled. It must be confined for the present to Boycott, and we must avoid giving battle on the crucial question of taxation for the sole reason that a No-Taxes campaign demands a perfect organisation and an ultimate preparedness from which we are yet far off. We will attack the resources of the bureaucracy whenever we can do so by simple abstention, as in the case of its immoral Akbari revenue; but we do not propose at present to follow European precedents and refuse the payment of taxes legally demanded from us. We desire to keep our resistance within the bounds of law, so long as law does not seek directly to interfere with us and render impossible our progress and the conscientious discharge of our duty to our fellow countrymen. But if, at any time, laws should be passed with the object of summarily checking our self-development or unduly limiting our rights as men, we must be prepared to break the law and endure the penalty imposed for the breach with the object of making it unworkable as has been done in other countries. We must equally be ready to challenge by our action arbitrary executive coercion, if we do not wish to see our resistance snuffed out by very cheap official extinguishers. Nor must we shrink from boycotting persons as well as things; we must

make full though discriminating use of the social boycott against those of our countrymen who seek to baffle the will of the nation in a matter vital to its emancipation, for this is a crime of *lese-nation* which is far more heinous than the legal offence of *lese-majeste* and deserves the severest penalty with which the nation can visit traitors.

We advocate, finally, the creation of a strong central authority to carry out the will of the nation, supported by a close and active organisation of village, town, district and province. We desire to build up this organisation from the constitution the necessity of which the Congress has recognised and for which it has provided a meagre and imperfect beginning ; but if, owing to Moderate obstruction, this constitution cannot develop or is not allowed to perform its true functions, the organisation and the authority must be built up otherwise by the people itself and, if necessary, outside the Congress.

The double policy of self-development and defensive resistance is the common standing-ground of the new spirit all over India. Some may not wish to go beyond its limits, others may look outside it ; but so far all are agreed. For ourselves we avow that we advocate passive resistance without wishing to make a dogma of it. In a subject nationality, to win liberty for one's country is the first duty of all, by whatever means, at whatever sacrifice ; and this duty must override all other considerations. The work of national emancipation is a great and holy *yajna* of which Boycott, Swadeshi, National Education and every other activity, great and small, are only major or minor parts. Liberty is the fruit we seek from the sacrifice and the Motherland the goddess to whom we offer it ; into the seven leaping tongues of the fire of the *yajna* we must offer all that we are and all that we have, feeding the fire even with our blood and lives and happiness of our nearest and dearest ; for the Motherland is a goddess who loves not a maimed and imperfect sacrifice, and freedom was never won from the gods by a grudging giver. But every great *yajna* has its Rakshasas who strive to baffle the sacrifice, to bespatter it with their own dirt or by guile or violence put out the flame. Passive resistance is an attempt to meet such disturbers by peaceful and self-con-

tained *brahmatejas*; but even the greatest Rishis of old could not, when the Rakshasas were fierce and determined, keep up the sacrifice without calling in the bow of the Kshatriya. We should have the bow of the Kshatriya ready for use, though in the background. Politics is especially the business of the Kshatriya, and without Kshatriya strength at its back, all political struggle is unavailing.

Vedantism accepts no distinction of true or false religions, but considers only what will lead more or less surely, more or less quickly to *moksa*, spiritual emancipation and the realisation of the Divinity within. Our attitude is a political Vedantism. India, free, one and indivisible, is the divine realisation to which we move,—emancipation our aim; to that end each nation must practise the political creed which is the most suited to its temperament and circumstances; for that is the best for it which leads most surely and completely to national liberty and national self-realisation. But whatever leads only to continued subjection must be spewed out as mere vileness and impurity. Passive resistance may be the final method of salvation in our case or it may be only the preparation for the final *sadhana*. In either case, the sooner we put it into full and perfect practice, the nearer we shall be to national liberty.

THE MORALITY OF BOYCOTT*

Ages ago there was a priest of Baal who thought himself commissioned by the god to kill all who did not bow the knee to him. All men, terrified by the power and ferocity of the priest, bowed down before the idol and pretended to be his servants; and the few who refused had to take refuge in hills and deserts. At last, a deliverer came and slew the priest and the world had rest. The slayer was blamed by those who placed religion in quietude and put passivity forward as the ideal ethics, but the world looked on him as an incarnation of God.

*This article was intended for th *Bande Mataram* but could not be published. It was seized by the Police and made an exhibit in the Alipore Conspiracy Case (May, 1908).

A certain class of mind shrinks from aggressiveness as if it were a sin. Their temperament forbids them to feel the delight of battle and they look on what they cannot understand as something monstrous and sinful. 'Heal hate by love', 'drive out injustice by justice', 'slay sin by righteousness' is their cry. Love is a sacred name, but it is easier to speak of love than to love. The love which drives out hate is a divine quality of which only one man in a thousand is capable. A saint full of love for all mankind possesses it, a philanthropist consumed with a desire to heal the miseries of the race possesses it, but the mass of mankind does not and cannot rise to the height. Politics is concerned with masses of mankind and not with individuals. To ask masses of mankind to act as saints, to rise to the height of divine love and practise it in relation to their adversaries or oppressors is to ignore human nature. It is to set a premium on injustice and violence by paralysing the hand of the deliverer when raised to strike. The Gita is the best answer to those who shrink from battle as a sin, and aggression as a lowering of morality.

A poet of sweetness and love, who has done much to awaken Bengal, has written deprecating the boycott as an act of hate. The saintliness of spirit which he would see brought into politics is the reflex of his own personality colouring the political ideals of a sattwic race. But in reality the boycott is not an act of hate. It is an act of self-defence, of aggression for the sake of self-preservation. To call it an act of hate is to say that a man who is being slowly murdered, is not justified in striking at his murderer. To tell that man that he must desist from using the first effective weapon that comes to his hand, because the blow would be an act of hate, is precisely on a par with this deprecation of boycott. Doubtless the self-defender is not precisely actuated by a feeling of holy sweetness towards his assailant; but to expect so much from human nature is impracticable. Certain religions demand it, but they have never been practised to the letter by their followers.

Hinduism recognises human nature and makes no such impossible demand. It sets one ideal for the saint, another for the man of action, a third for the trader, a fourth for the serf.

To prescribe the same ideal for all is to bring about *varnasankara*, the confusion of duties, and destroy society and race. If we are content to be serfs, then indeed, boycott is a sin for us, not because it is a violation of love, but because it is a violation of the Sudra's duty of obedience and contentment. Politics is the ideal of the Kshatriya, and the morality of the Kshatriya ought to govern our political actions. To impose in politics the Brahmanical duty of saintly sufferance is to preach *varnasankara*.

Love has a place in politics, but it is the love of one's country, for one's countrymen, for the glory, greatness and happiness of the race, the divine *ananda* of self-immolation for one's fellows, the ecstasy of relieving their sufferings, the joy of seeing one's blood flow for country and freedom, the bliss of union in death with the fathers of the race. The feeling of almost physical delight in the touch of the mother-soil, of the winds that blow from Indian seas, of the rivers that stream from Indian hills, in the hearing of Indian speech, music, poetry, in the familiar sights, sounds, habits, manners dress, of our Indian life, this is the physical root of that love. The pride in our past, the pain of our present, the passion for the future are its trunk and branches. Self-sacrifice and self-forgetfulness, great service, high endurance for the country are its fruit. And the sap which keeps it alive is the realisation of the Motherhood of God in the country, the vision of the Mother, the knowledge of the Mother, the perpetual contemplation, adoration and service of the Mother.

Other love than this is foreign to the motives of political action. Between nation and nation there is justice, partiality, chivalry, duty, but not love. All love is either individual or for the self in the race or for the self in mankind. It may exist between individuals of different races, but the love of one race for another is a thing foreign to Nature. When therefore the boycott, as declared by the Indian race against the British, is stigmatised for want of love, the charge is bad psychology as well as bad morality. It is interest warring against interest, and hatred is directed not really against the race, but against the adverse interest. If the British exploitation were to cease

tomorrow, the hatred against the British race would disappear in a moment. A partial *adhyaropa* makes the ignorant for the moment see in the exploiters and not in the exploitation the receptacle of the hostile feeling. But like all *maya*, it is an unreal feeling and sentiment and is not shared by those who think. Not hatred against foreigners, but antipathy to the evils of foreign exploitation is the true root of boycott.

If hatred is demoralising, it is also stimulating. The web of life has been made a mingled strain of good and evil and God works His ends through the evil as well as through the good. Let us discharge our minds of hate, but let us not deprecate a great and necessary movement because, in the inevitable course of human nature, it has engendered feelings of hostility and hatred. If hatred came, it was necessary that it should come as a stimulus, as a means of awakening.

When *tamas*, inertia, torpor have benumbed a nation, the strongest forms of *rajas* are necessary to break the spell; there is no form of *rajas* so strong as hatred. Through *rajas* we rise to *sattva* and for the Indian temperament the transition does not take long. Already the element of hatred is giving place to the clear conception of love for the Mother as the spring of our political actions.

Another question is the use of violence in the furtherance of boycott. This is, in our view, purely a matter of policy and expediency. An act of violence brings us into conflict and may be inexpedient for a race circumstanced like ours. But the moral question does not arise. The argument that to use violence is to interfere with personal liberty involves a singular misunderstanding of the very nature of politics. The whole of politics is an interference with personal liberty. Law is such an interference; protection is such an interference; the rule which makes the will of the majority prevail is such an interference. The right to prevent such use of personal liberty as will injure the interests of the race, is the fundamental law of society. From this point of view the nation is only using its primary rights when it restrains the individual from buying or selling foreign goods.

It may be argued that peaceful compulsion is one thing, and violent compulsion, another. Social boycott may be justifiable, but not the burning or drowning of British goods. The latter method, we reply, is illegal and therefore may be inexpedient, but it is not morally unjustifiable. The morality of the Kshatriya justifies violence in times of war, and boycott is a war. Nobody blames the Americans for throwing British tea into Boston harbour, nor can anybody blame a similar action in India on moral grounds. It is reprehensible from the point of view of law, of social peace and order, not of political morality. It has been eschewed by us because it is unwise and because it carried the battle on to a ground where we are comparatively weak, from a ground where we are strong.

Under other circumstances we might have followed the American precedent, and if we had done so, historians and moralists would have applauded, not censured.

Justice and righteousness are the atmosphere of political morality, but the justice and righteousness of a fighter, not of the priest. Aggression is unjust only when unprovoked; violence, unrighteous when used wantonly or for unrighteous ends. It is a barren philosophy which applies a mechanical rule to all actions, or takes a word and tries to fit all human life into it.

The sword of the warrior is as necessary to the fulfilment of justice and righteousness as the holiness of the saint. Ramdas is not complete without Shivaji. To maintain justice and prevent the strong from despoiling, and the weak from being oppressed, is the function for which the Kshatriya was created. "Therefore," says Sri Krishna in the *Mahabharata*, "God created battle and armour, the sword, the bow and the dagger".

Man is of a less terrestrial mould than some would have him to be. He has an element of the divine which the politician ignores. The practical politician looks to the position at the moment and imagines that he has taken everything into

consideration. He has, indeed, studied the surface and the immediate surroundings, but he has missed what lies beyond material vision. He has left out of account the divine, the incalculable in man, that element which upsets the calculations of the schemer and disconcerts the wisdom of the diplomat.

PHEROZSHAHI AT SURAT

The methods of Moderate autocrats are as instructive as they are peculiar. The account of the characteristic proceedings of Sir Pherozshah Mehta at the Surat Conference, which we published in yesterday's correspondence columns, bears a strong family likeness to the ways of the Provincial Congress autocrats all India over. The selection of a subservient President who will call white black at dictatorial bidding ; the open scorn of public opinion ; the disregard of justice, of fair play, of constitutional practice and procedure, of equality of all before recognised law and rule, and of every other principle essential to a self-governing body ; the arrogant claim on account of past "services" to assert private wishes, opinions, conveniences, as superior to the wishes, opinions and conveniences of the people's delegates ; these are common and universal characteristics in the procedure of our autocratic democrats. The difference is merely in personal temperament and manner of expression. "The State ? I am the State," cried Louis XIV. "The country ? I am the country !" cries Sir Pherozshah Mehta or Pundit Madan Mohan Malaviya or Mr. Krishnaswamy Aiyar, as the case may be. Only, as his personality is more robust, so is Sir Pherozshah's dictatorial arrogance more public, open and contemptuous than that of his compeers in less favoured Provinces. If the popular cause is to make any progress, if we are to show ourselves worthy of the self-government we claim, this strong-handed autocracy must itself be put down with the strong hand. As Mr. Tilak pointed out at Kolahpur, the object of the national movement is not to replace foreign autocrats by the Swadeshi article, but to replace an irresponsible bureaucracy by popular self-government.

The most extraordinary of Sir Pherozshah's freaks at Surat was not his treatment of Sir Bhalchandra as if the President of

the Conference were his tame cat,—for what else was the Knight of the Umbrella, pushed into a position to which he has no claims of any kind ? Nor was it his exclusion of the Aundh Commission from consideration by the Conference ; it is part of the orthodox Congress "nationalism" to exclude the Princes and Chiefs of India from consideration as if they were not an important part of the nation, and to leave them without sympathy or support to the tender mercies of the Foreign Office. Nor was it his turning the Conference into a tool for ventilating his personal grievances against Bombay officialdom. It was his action with regard to the question of National Education.

Let us consider one by one the pleas by which he managed to exclude this all-important Resolution from the deliberations of the Conference. They show the peculiar mental texture of our leaders and their crude notions of the politics which they profess. The first plea is that the Resolutions of the Congress are not binding upon the Conference. What then is the necessity or purpose of the Congress ? As we understand it, the Resolutions of the Congress embody the opinions and aspirations of the united people of India ; they put forward the minimum reforms which that people are agreed to demand from the Government or to effect for themselves. A Provincial Conference can go beyond these minimum reforms if the circumstances of the Province or the general opinion of the public demand it ; it cannot diminish, ignore or go behind them without dissociating itself from the programme approved by the nation and breaking up all chances of an united advance. If these are not the relations of Congress and Conference, will Sir Pherozshah inform us what are the true relations ? If the Conference does not exist in order to carry forward the national programme with whatever additions the Province may find necessary for its own purposes, does it then exist only in order to record the decrees and opinions of a few Provincial leaders.

The second plea was that Sir Pherozshah Mehta could not understand the meaning of National Education. At Ahmedabad, we remember, the Swadeshi Resolution was disallowed in

the Subjects Committee because Sir Pherozshah Mehta would not know where he could get his broadcloth, if it were passed ! The nation was not to resolve on helping forward it commercial independence, because Sir Pherozshah Mehta preferred broadcloth to any other wear. And now the people of Bombay are not to educate themselves on national lines because Sir Pherozshah Mehta does not know what a nation means nor what nationalism means nor, in fact, anything except what Sir Pherozshah Mehta means.

When, on a vote of the Subjects Committee, the Resolution was declared by the President to be lost, it seems to have been the opinion of a large body of the delegates that this was a misdeclaration. The obvious course was, under such circumstances, a count of votes by tellers on each side. But Sir Pherozshah was ready with his third plea that this would be to question the veracity of the President. We cannot too strongly insist that politics is not a social drawing-room for the interchange of courtly amenities. Where there is a question of constitutional right, to bring in personal arguments of this kind is to show that you have not grasped the elementary principles of democratic politics. The very first of these principles is that law rules and not persons,—the person is only an instrument of the law. The President or Chairman of a body sits there to keep order and see that law and rule are observed,—he does not sit there to make his own will the law. If therefore there is any question of a miscount, it is his bounden duty to see that immediate measures are taken to satisfy both parties as to its correctness and it is the natural right of the members to demand such a count. That right ought not to be waived in deference to the tender delicacy of a Chairman's self-love, nor has he or his friends any right to talk nonsense about his veracity being questioned or himself being insulted. Such mouthings show either a guilty conscience which cannot face public scrutiny or an entire moral unfitness for leadership in any constitutional proceedings.

We regret that the delegates at Surat did not insist on their rights. Sir Pherozshah Mehta came to Calcutta, prepared to do at the Congress precisely what he has now been doing at the

Conference ; but he found a spirit awakened in Bengal before which a hundred Pherozshahs are as mere chaff before the wind. It is a spirit which will tolerate no dictation except from the nation and from the laws which the nation imposes on itself. The progress of the National cause depends on the awakening of that spirit throughout India. Let there be only one dictator—the People.

NATIONALISM, NOT EXTREMISM

It is a curious fact that even after so many months of sustained propaganda and the most clear and definite statements of the New Politics, there should still be so much confusion as to the attitude of the Nationalist Party and the elementary issues they have raised. This confusion is to some extent due to wilful distortion and deliberate evasion of the true issues. The ultra-loyalist publicists especially, Indian or Anglo-Indian, are obliged to ignore the true position of the party, misnamed Extremists, because they are unable to meet its trenchant and irresistible logic and common sense. But with the great majority of Indian politicians, the misapprehension is genuine. The political teaching of the New School is so novel and disturbing to their settled political ideas,—or rather the conventional, abstract, second-hand formulas which take the place of ideas—that they cannot even grasp its true nature and turn from it with repugnance before they have given themselves time to understand it. The most obstinate of these misapprehensions is the idea that the New Politics is a counsel of despair, a mad revolutionary fury induced by Curzonian reaction. We can afford to pass over this misapprehension with contempt, when it is put forward by foolish, prejudiced or conceited critics who are merely trying to bring odium on the movement or to express their enlightened superiority over younger politicians. But when a fair and scrupulous opponent honestly trying to understand the nationalist position falls into the same error, we are bound to meet it and once more clear our position beyond misapprehension or doubt.

Some friends of ours have thought that we were unnecessarily harsh and even unjust in our criticism of Dr. Rash Behari Ghose's speech in the Supreme Legislative Council. They urge

that Dr. Ghose at least presented the Extremist position with great energy, clearness, courage, and did it with the greater effect as one who himself stood outside our party. We have every respect for Dr. Rash Behari Ghose personally; he is perhaps the foremost jurist in India, a scholar and master of the English tongue, a mine of literature in possession of a style of his own, too rich and scholarly to be turned to such everyday uses as a Legislative Council speech. But eminence in law and literature do not necessarily bring with them a grasp of politics. Dr. Ghose has only recently turned his attention to this field and has not been long enough in touch with the actualities of politics to get a real grasp of them. It is therefore natural that he should be misled by names instead of penetrating beyond names to the true aspects of current politics. The ordinary nick-names of Moderate and Extremist do not properly describe the parties which they are used to label; and they are largely responsible for much confusion of ideas as to the real difference between the two schools. Dr. Ghose evidently labours, like many others, under the obsession of the word Extremist. He imagines that the essential difference between the parties is a difference in attitude and in the intensity of feeling. The Extremists, in his view, are men embittered by oppression which makes even wise men mad; full of passionate repining at their "more than Egyptian bondage", exasperated by bureaucratic reaction, despairing of redress at the hands of the British Government or the British nation, they are advocating an extreme attitude and extreme methods in a spirit of desperate impatience. The Extremist propaganda is, therefore, a protest against misgovernment and a movement of despair driving towards revolt. We are unable to accept this statement of the nationalist position. On the contrary, it so successfully represents the new politics to be what they are not, that we choose it as a starting-point for our explanation of what they are.

The new movement is not primarily a protest against bad Government—it is a protest against the continuance of British control; whether that control is used well or ill, justly or unjustly, is a minor and unessential consideration It is not born of a disappointed expectation of admission to British

citizenship,—it is born of a conviction that the time has come when India can, should and will become a great, free and united nation. It is not a negative current of destruction, but a positive, constructive impulse towards the making of modern India. It is not a cry of revolt and despair, but a gospel of national faith and hope. Its true description is not Extremism, but Democratic Nationalism.

These are the real issues. There are at present not two parties in India, but three,—the Loyalists, the Moderates and the Nationalists. The Loyalists would be satisfied with good Government by British rulers and a limited share in the administration ; the Moderates desire self-government within the British Empire, but are willing to wait for it indefinitely ; the Nationalists would be satisfied with nothing less than independence whether within the Empire, if that be possible, or outside it ; they believe that the nation cannot and ought not to wait, but must bestir itself immediately, if it is not to perish as a nation. The Loyalists believe that Indians have not the capacities and qualities necessary for freedom and even if they succeed in developing the necessary fitness, they would do better for themselves and mankind by remaining as a province of the British Empire ; any attempt at freedom will, they think, be a revolt against Providence and can bring nothing but disaster on the country. The Loyalist view is that India cannot, should not and will not be free, great and united nation. The Moderates believe the nation to be too weak and disunited to aim at freedom ; they would welcome independence if it came, but they are not convinced that we have or shall have in the measurable future the means or strength to win it or keep it if won. They therefore put forward Colonial Self-Government as their aim and are unwilling to attempt any methods which presuppose strength and cohesion in the nation. The Moderate view is that India may eventually be united, self-governing within limits and prosperous, but not free and great. The Nationalists hold that Indians are as capable of freedom as any subject nation can be and their defects are the result of servitude and can only be removed by the struggle for freedom ; that v have the strength, and, if they get the will, can create the means to win

independence. They hold that the choice is not between autonomy and provincial Home Rule or between freedom and dependence, but between freedom and national decay and death. They hold, finally, that the past history of our country and the present circumstances are of such a kind that the great unifying tendencies hitherto baffled by insuperable obstacles have at last found the right conditions for success. They believe that the fated hour for Indian unification and freedom has arrived. In brief, they are convinced that India should strive to be free, that she can be free and that she will, by the impulse of her past and present, be inevitably driven to the attempt and the attainment of national self-realisation. The Nationalist creed is a gospel of faith and hope.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF NATIONALITY

Mr. N.N. Ghose of the *Indian Nation* has some name in this country as an educated end even a learned man. He himself does not conceal his opinion that he is almost if not quite the only well-educated man in India and is perpetually asking the acknowledged exponents of public opinion on the Nationalist side what educational qualifications they possess which would justify them in advising or instructing their countrymen in politics. At one time it is the conductors of *Bande Mataram* who are put to the question, at another it is so able a political thinker and orator as Srijut Bepin Chandra Pal whose speeches and writings have extorted the reluctant admiration of our bitterest opponents in England ; at another it is the editor of *Yugantor* who is apostrophied as an ill-educated adolescent—a paper every single issue of which evidences more knowledge, reading and power of thought and expression than the whole year's output of the *Indian Nation.* In the latest issue of his weekly Mr. Ghose has penned an article on the prospects of Nationality in India—which he thinks to be very bad indeed—and in trying to support his thesis by examples from history he has perpetrated such astonishing blunders, of so gross and elementary a character, that one wonders what ill-educated adolescent usurped the editorial chair usually occupied by the Principal of the Metropolitan College. We will give only a few samples of Mr. Ghose's historical knowledge. The unification of the Italian republics into a nation, he says, was not so much the effect as

the cause of Italian independence. We leave for the moment the truth of the statement which is contrary to the facts of history ; but we should like to know what on earth our universal critic means by his Italian republics ? There were republics in mediaeval Italy, but we did not know that Naples and Sicily were republics under King Bomba, or Rome under the Popes, or Tuscany under the Grand Duke, or Lombardy under the Austrians, or Sardinia and Piedmont under the descendants of Victor Amadeus. Then again Mr. Ghose has "observed" that the different States of Greece developed a National unity as soon as they had a common enemy in the Persian. Really ? We had always thought that the one outstanding fact of Greek history was the utter inability of these states to develop national unity at all, the sentiment of Panhellenism never having a look-in against the separatist spirit of the city-states. And then he tells us that the provinces and states of ancient Italy (whatever that may mean) also readily united into a great national states in the presence of a foreign enemy. Yet those foolish historians tell us that Italy was united not at all willingly by the Roman sword and the Carthaginian invasion simply tested the solidity of the Roman structure ; it certainly did not create it. But it would be a wearisome task to hunt down all the errors with which the article is packed. We think that after this Mr. N.N. Ghose had better stop questioning other people about their qualifications for instructing the people and examine his own.

But in spite of his historical blunders he has succeeded in giving expression to a very common error which troubles many patriotic people and unnerves their faith and weakens the quality of their patriotism. "Let it be distinctly remembered and never forgotten that the essential conditions of a nationality are unity of language, unity of religion and life, unity of race." And because there is diversity of race, religion and language in India he thinks that there is no possibility of creating a nationality in this country. This is a very common stumbling-block, but is there any reality in it ? Rather we find that every nationality has been formed not because of, but in spite of, diversity of race or religion or language, and not unoften in spite of the co-existence of all these diversities. The *Indian Nation* has itself admitted that the English nation has been

built out of various races, but he has not stated the full complexity of the British nation. He has not observed that to this day the races which came later into the British nationality keep their distinct individuality even now and that one of them clings to its language tenaciously. He has carefully omitted the striking example of Switzerland where distinct racial strains speaking three different languages and, later, professing different religions, coalesced into and persisted as one nation without sacrificing a single one of these diversities. In France three different languages are spoken ; in America the candidates for White House address the nation in fourteen languages, Austria is a congeries of races and languages, the divisions in Russia are hardly less acute. That unity in race, religion or language is essential to nationality is an idea which will not bear examination. Such elements of unity are very helpful to the growth of a nationality, but they are not essential and will not even of themselves assure its growth. The Roman Empire though it created a common language, a common religion and life, and did its best to crush out racial diversities under the heavy weight of its uniform system failed to make one great nation.

If these are not essential elements of nationality, what, it may be asked, are the essential elements ? We answer that there are certain essential conditions, geographical unity, a common past, a powerful common interest impelling towards unity and certain favourable political conditions which enable the impulse to realise itself in an organised government expressing the nationality and perpetuating its single and united existence. This may be provided by a part of the nation, a race or community, uniting the others under its leadership or domination, or by an united resistance to a common pressure from outside or within. A common enthusiasm coalescing with a common interest is the most powerful fosterer of nationality. We believe that the necessary elements are present in India, we believe that the time has come and that by a common resistance to a common pressure in the shape of the boycott, inspired by a common enthusiasm and ideal, that united nationality for which the whole history of India has been a preparation, will be speedily and mightily accomplished.

TILAK AND PRESIDENTSHIP

While writing of the Nagpur imbroglio we have touched very lightly on the question of Mr. Tilak's Presidentship, the dispute over which was the beginning and real cause of the discord at Nagpur. We regard this issue as one of immense importance and shall today try to make clear our position in the matter and the reasons why we attach such a supreme importance to it. The Bombay Moderates with their usual skill in the use of their one strong weapon, misrepresentation, have been writing and speaking as if the question of Mr. Tilak's election to the President's chair were a personal issue; they blame Mr. Tilak for not withdrawing from the field, talk of us as Tilakites and assume throughout that we are fighting for a man and not for a principle. If it were a personal matter, Mr. Tilak who has always been an unselfish and unassuming patriot, always averse to pushing himself or to figuring personally more than was necessary for his work, always a strong fighter for the success of his ideas and methods but never for his own hand, would be the first to obviate all discord by withdrawing. But it is not a personal matter and Mr. Tilak has not himself come forward as a candidate for the Presidentship. His name was put forward last year by the Bengal Nationalists without consulting him and was again put forward this year as the embodiment of a principle. This being so, Mr. Tilak has no voice in the matter except as an individual member of the Nationalist Party, and is not entitled to withdraw his name except with the consent of his party. In fact, his personal right of accepting or refusing the Presidentship can only arise when and if it is offered him by the local Reception Committee or the All-India Committee. That the Moderates should not be able to understand this is natural; their conception of a leader and the Nationalist conception of a leader are as the poles asunder. Mr. Tilak by his past career, his unequalled abilities and capacity for leadership, his splendid courage and self-sacrifice, his services to the cause and the disinterestedness and devotion with which he used his influence, is naturally the most prominent of the Nationalist leaders, and our party looks up to his experience, skill, cool acuteness and moral strength for guidance on great occasions like the Congress session when it has to act as a single body. But our idea of a leader is not and will never be one whom we have to

follow as an individual for his own sake, whether he is right or wrong; we follow him only so long as he is faithful to the principles of Nationalism and is ready to fight its battles in accordance with the collective will of the party.

The question was first raised last year in Bengal when at a meeting of the Nationalists in Calcutta it was decided to suggest to the country the name of Mr. Tilak as President of the Calcutta Congress and in accordance with this decision Srijut Bepin Chandra Pal, who was then touring in the Mofussil, was communicated with and asked to bring the question forward and take the sense of the public upon it in Eastern Bengal. We have never concealed the fact that this was deliberately done in order to throw down the gauntlet publicly to Loyalism, Anti-Swadeshism, Moderatism and every other *ism* which seeks to bring in foreign considerations and alloy or weaken the pure and uncompromising Nationalist creed. The nomination of Mr. Tilak was a crucial point as between the two parties, for three separate reasons. At that time the country was divided between the Swadeshists on principle and the Anti-Swadeshists —or, let us say, "honest" Swadeshists of the Mehta-Wacha type and still more sharply between Boycotters and those who trembled at the very name of Boycott. From this point of view, the attempt to secure Mr. Tilak's nomination was an attempt on our part to have the Swadeshi-Boycott propaganda recognised on the Congress platform. Secondly, there was and still is a small ring of Congress officials who treat the Congress as their own private property, decide in secret conclave what it shall do or not do, and hand round the Presidentship among themselves and the occasional newcomers admitted to their ranks from the Legislative Councils, except when a live M.P. can be secured from England or a Mahomedan had to be nominated to demonstrate Hindu-Musulman unity. The second object of the attempt to get Mr. Tilak nominated was to break through this oligarchic ring and establish the true nature of the Congress as no mere machinery to be engineered by a few wealthy or successful proprietors, but a popular assembly in which the will of the people must prevail. Thirdly, the opposition to Mr. Tilak and the attempt to force him always into the background arose largely from the feeling that Mr.

Tilak's views and personality are objectionable to the bureaucracy and that the nomination of a public man once convicted of sedition would deprive the Congress and, what was more important to Loyalists, leading men of the Congress, of all chance of Government favour. But these very reasons which made the name of Mr. Tilak an offence and a stumbling-block to the Loyalists, imposed upon the Nationalist Party the duty of bringing forward Mr. Tilak's name year after year until he is elected. Leadership in the Congress must no longer be regarded as a convenient and profitable road to appointments on the Bench and in the Government Councils but as a post of danger and a position of service to the people and it must depend on service done and suffering endured for the cause and not in the slightest degree on bureaucratic approval and the national movement must be recognised as a sacred cause which exists in its own right and cannot consent to be regulated by the smiles and frowns of the bureaucracy which it is its first object to displace. These are the principles for which our party are contending when they insist on Mr. Tilak's nomination and they are principles which are essential to the Nationalist position and are as living today as they were last year. The question of Mr. Tilak's Presidentship will be always with us until it is finally set at rest by his election, for until then we shall pass it year after year.

But so far as the Nagpur session is concerned, the question no longer exists. The attempt to make this question wholly responsible for the difficulty is disingenuous and the demand that Mr. Tilak should throw over his own party by a gratuitous refusal to be President if ever he is asked, so as to reassure irreconcilable Loyalists in their fears, is absolutely preposterous. The Nagpur Nationalists have put his name forward and they alone are competent to withdraw it. But such withdrawal is not necessary. They have failed to secure the necessary three-fourths majority and they can therefore no longer insist on his name unless they are asked to hold the Congress with their own funds. They are willing to withdraw in a body from the Reception Committee if the Moderates so desire ; they are willing to co-operate on lines both definite and reasonable ; and they are willing, if called upon, to hold the Congress with any Moderate

President in the chair if the funds in Mr. Dixit's hands are paid in. But they are not willing to misappropriate public money for the Congress funds and they are not willing to walk into the Loyalist trap by an admission of any personal responsibility for the disturbances that have taken place, in the shape of a guarantee that no disturbance of any kind shall take place at the time of the Congress. Such a guarantee can only be given by those who were responsible for the rowdyism or instigated it, and this unwarrantable charge has already been emphatically denied by the leading Nationalists ; to ask them to give a guarantee is to ask them to admit what they have already denied. If therefore the Moderates insist on these preposterous conditions, the public will know whom they have to blame.

SWARAJ

Nationalism was filled at the Pabna conference with a new spirit unlike anything yet known to us. Whatever resolutions were passed or steps taken, were taken in a spirit of practical utility, which has been hitherto absent from our Congresses and Conferences. We have hitherto been engaged in dispute about ideals and methods. We are confident that the country, at least Bengal, has now reached a stage when this dispute is no longer necessary. Whatever we may say out of policy of fear, the whole nation is now at one. Swaraj is the only goal which the heart of Bengal recognises, Swaraj without any limitation or reservation. Even the President in his second and closing speech was so much moved by the spirit in the air that he forgot the feeling of caution which obliged him in his opening address to deprecate ambitious ideals, and out of the gladness of his heart there burst from him a flood of inspiring eloquence which made the whole audience astir with feelings of impassioned aspiration. Swaraj was the theme of his eloquence and to anyone listening carefully it was evident that 'Swaraj', unlimited and without reservation, was the ideal enthroned in the heart of the poet. Even Surendranath or those who voted for colonial Swaraj knew well in their heart of hearts that their ideal was not the ideal of the nation. Long habit and apprehension were the only obstacles in their way which prevented them from throwing themselves into the current. But the rest of the audience were visibly moved by the

passionate eloquence which flowed from the lips of Rabindranath. What matters it what resolutions may be passed or rejected? Swaraj is no longer a mere word, no longer an ideal, distant and impossible, for the heart of Bengal has seized upon it, and the intellect of Bengal has acknowledged it. We hold no brief for anyone, but we believe that Srijut Manoranjan Guha was an inspired speaker when he told the Conference never to lose sight of God in the movement. Mighty aspirations are in the heart of the people and he is false to the inspiration within him who tries to dwarf them. Let us work practically at the smallest details, but let us never forget that the work is not for its own sake but for the sake of Swaraj. We shall be false to our inspiration if we forget the goal in the details; we shall condemn ourselves to the fate of the man who in the eagerness of picking up pebbles on the seashore threw away the alchemic stone, which God had for a moment given into the hands. Swaraj is the alchemic stone, the Parash-Pathar, and we have it in our hands. It will turn to gold everything we touch. Village Samitis are good, not for the sake of village Samitis but for the sake of Swaraj. Boycott is good, not for the sake of Boycott but for the sake of Swaraj. Swadeshi is good, not for the sake of Swadeshi but for the sake of Swaraj. Arbitration is good, not for the sake of arbitration but for the sake of Swaraj. If we forget Swaraj and win anything else we shall be like the seeker whose belt was turned indeed to gold but the stone of alchemy was lost to him for ever.

Never should we forget that but for the hope of Swaraj we should never have done what we have done during the last three years. No lesser hope, no ideal of inferior grandeur could have nerved us to the tremendous efforts, the great sacrifices, the indomitable persistence in the face of persecution which has made these three years ever memorable as the bath-time of a nation. Who could have borne what we have borne for the sake of some petty object? No good can result from denying what God has revealed to us. When Peter denied his master, half of his virtue went out of him. Let not our people have to repent as Peter had to repent, and shed tears of bitter sorrow because the divinity has been expelled by their own folly from

their bosom. When a light has been revealed, folly alone will try to shut it out behind a screen. When a mighty power has entered into the heart, madness alone can wish to forfeit it. Swaraj is the direct revelation of God to this people,—not mere political freedom but a freedom vast and entire, freedom of the individual, freedom of the community, freedom of the nation, spiritual freedom, social freedom, political freedom. Spiritual freedom the ancient Rishis had already declared to us; social freedom was part of the message of Buddha, Chaitanya, Nanak and Kabir and the saints of Maharashtra; political freedom is the last word of the triune gospel. Without political freedom the soul of man is crippled. Only a few mighty spirits can rise above their surroundings, but the ordinary man is a slave of his surroundings and if those be mean, servile and degraded, he himself will be mean, servile and degraded. Social freedom can only be born where the soul of man is large, free and generous, not enslaved to petty aims and thoughts. Social freedom is not a result of social machinery but of the freedom of the human intellect and the nobility of the human soul. A man who follows petty ends cannot feel his brotherhood with his fellows, for he is always striving to raise himself above them and assert petty superiorities. If caste makes him superior or money makes him superior, he will hug to his bosom the distinctions of caste or the distinctions of wealth. If political freedom is absent, the community has no great ends to follow and the individual is confined within a narrow circuit in which the superiority of caste, wealth or class is the only ambition which he can cherish. If political freedom opens to him a wider horizon, he forgets the lesser ambitions. Moreover a slave can never be noble and broad-minded. He cannot forget himself in the service of his fellows; for he is already a slave and service is the badge of his degradation, not a willing self-devotion. When man is thus degraded, it is idle to think that society can be free.

So too spiritual freedom can never be the lot of many in a land of slaves. A few may follow the path of the Yogin and rise above their surroundings, but the mass of men cannot ever take the first step towards spiritual salvation. We do not

believe that the path of salvation lies in selfishness. If the mass of men around us is miserable, fallen, degraded how can the seeker after God be indifferent to the condition of his brothers? Compassion to all creatures is the condition of sainthood, and the perfect Yogin is he who is *sarvabhutahite ratah*, whose mind is full of the will to do good to all creatures. When a man shuts his heart to the cries of sufferings around him, when he is content that his fellow-men should be sorrowful, oppressed, sacrificed to the greed of others, he is making his own way to salvation full of difficulties and stumbling-blocks. He is forgetting that God is not only in himself but in all these millions. And for those who have not the strength, spiritual freedom in political servitude is a sheer impossibility. When India was free, thousands of men set their feet in the stairs of heaven, but as the night deepened and the sun of liberty withdrew its rays, the spiritual force inborn in every Indian heart became weaker and weaker until now it burns so faintly that aliens have taken upon themselves the role of spiritual teachers, and the people chosen by God have to sit at the feet of the men from whose ancestry the light was hidden. God has set apart India as the eternal fountain-head of holy spirituality, and He will never suffer that fountain to run dry. Therefore Swaraj has been revealed to us. By our political freedom we shall once more recover our spiritual freedom. Once more in the land of the saints and sages will burn up the fire of the ancient Yoga and the hearts of her people will be lifted up into the neighbourhood of the Eternal.

THE FUTURE OF THE MOVEMENT

When a great people rises from the dust, what *mantra* is the *Sanjivani mantra* or what power is the resurrecting force of its resurgence? In India there are two great *mantras* the *mantra* of "Bande Mataram" which is the public and universal cry of awakened love of Motherland, and there is another more secret and mystic which is not yet revealed. The *mantra* of "Bande Mataram" is a *mantra* once before given to the world by the Sannyasins of the Vindhya hills. It was lost by the treachery of our own countrymen because the nation was not then ripe for resurgence and a premature awakening would have brought

about a speedy downfall. But when in the great earthquake of 1897 there was a voice heard by the Sannyasins, and they were conscious of the decree of God that India should rise again, the *mantra* was again revealed to the world. It was echoed in the hearts of the people, and when the cry had ripened in silence in a few great hearts, the whole nation became conscious of the revelation. Who imagined when the people of Bengal rose in 1905 against the Partition that that was the beginning of a great upheaval ? It is a passing tempest, said the wise men of England, let it go over our heads and we will wait. But the tempest did not pass, nor the thunders cease. So there was a reconsideration of policy and the wise men said,—"The people of Bengal are easily cowed down, and we will try whether force cannot do what patience has failed to do". When Sir Bampfylde Fuller met Lord Curzon at Agra, this was the policy agreed on between them—to hammer the Bengalis into quietude. But Sir Bampfylde Fuller has gone and the movement remains. Here too will go, and many will go, but the movement will remain. The regulation lathi, the Police truncheon, the threat of the Goorkha rifle are as straws in the wind before the Divine breath of God. Human power is mere weakness when measured with the will of the Eternal. So the movement will continue. It is now time to look deeper into it and know its fountain sources. So long we were content with the superficial aspects, but the time has come for God to reveal Himself, and the powers of the world to look on in amazement at His wonderful workings. When we left Pabna we knew that He was at work to unite the Bengali race. We hope yet to see that He is at work to unite the Indian people. When the Convention Committee meets at Allahabad, it will be seen whether it is His will to unite the parties into a single whole or to separate them from each other, so that the work of salvation may be hastened by the energy of the Nationalist Party being separated from the steadiness of the Moderates. Whatever may happen, it is His will. We look forward to the Easter meeting for light on what He intends. If the Moderate leaders of Bengal are wise, they will realise that Bengal at least is destined to become predominatingly Nationalist, that it is her mission to lead and force the rest of India to follow. Whoever tries to prevent her from

fulfilling that mission, is setting himself against the decrees of God and will be blown away like stubble before the tempest.

OLIGARCHY OR DEMOCRACY

Apart from questions of aims and method, a fruitful source of discord between the two parties has been the divergence of views with regard to the spirit of the Congress, whether it is to be the Congress of the few or the Congress of the many. This divergence has been chiefly operative in bringing about struggles over the election of the President and his method of conducting the proceedings, over the selection of the Subjects Committee and the rights of the delegates to express their opinion and use every means to make it operative. One side demands implicit obedience to the authority of the President and a small circle of leaders, the other claims that the President is only a servant of the Congress with a delegated and limited power, that the Congress is supreme and no small circle of leaders has a right to dictate to it, and that the obscurest delegate is by his very position equal in rights and status to the most distinguished men in the country. One side tries to form a Subjects Committee of the leading men in each province, the other tries to enforce the right of the delegates to make their own unhampered choice. One side wishes the Congress to register obediently the resolutions framed for it by wiser heads, the other claims a sovereign dignity and activity for the whole body and the utmost latitude of debate on all important questions. This difference of spirit has been the cause of even more discord and bitterness than the difference of aims and methods, and the most dffiicult and debatable points in the Congress Constitution will be those into which this issue enters.

In the early days of the world political development was the result of the needs of the civic organism ; in modern times it is powerfully swayed by ideas, and often the idea creates the need. English education has brought in the idea of democracy, of the sovereign right and power of the people, and a predilection for the forms of a democratic assembly. When, therefore, the Congress was instituted, the originators tried to cast it in the democratic mould, to clothe it in democratic

forms. But the idea by itself cannot become operative, it must first create a corresponding need. The Congress, therefore, while democratic in theory, was in reality a close oligarchy of the most primitive type. Claiming to realise in obedience to the most developed modern ideas the course of modern democratic development, it really followed in obedience to the actual political conditions of the country a course of primitive development very like in its essential features to the primitive constitutions of early times when democracy was unconsciously evolving. There was no electorate which could make the principle of election operative, no political vitality or habit of political thought in the people to put life into the forms of a democratic assembly, no battle of opinions which could hammer out the complete mould of a great deliberative assembly from the rough and shapeless mass called the Congress.

Nominally, the Congress was a sort of imitation Parliament and its delegates were supposed to be elected by the people and representatives of the people ; in reality, there was no electorate to represent and the forms of election degenerated into a farce ; five people often meeting to elect a hundred out of whom those only attended the Congress session who had time and leisure. In effect, therefore, the Congress was not a modern Parliament but a popular assembly like the old Aryan assemblies in which the whole body of the citizens could attend and all did attend who had the inclination and the leisure. But while the old Aryan assembly was actually the mustering of the citizens, the Congress was rather like those early federal assemblies held in a central place in which as many as could be attended from distance places and the bulk of the gathering was made up of local citizens. The peculiarity of the Congress has been the failure to provide against the preponderance of the local majority expect by the habit of aiming at unanimity in its resolutions. This flaw in the foundation has been largely responsible for the final tumbling to pieces of the structure. Nominally, again, the resolutions of the Congress were passed by the vote of the assembled delegates, as in a democratic chamber ; in reality, the delegates did not vote at all but, like the primitive assemblies, simply accepted by acclamation reso-

lutions ready prepared for them by a few influential men sitting in secret council. Nominally, the President was elected by the Congress and presided over the proceedings according to recognised rules of debate, but in reality he was chosen out of and by the small oligarchical circle which ruled the Congress, effected their decisions and carried out their will. His authority over the proceedings was unfettered by any written rules; the custom and the precedents of the assembly were the sole guide and these were interpreted by him according to the convenience of the Congress oligarchs. Thus the pretence of a modern democratic assembly reduced itself in practice to the reality of an oligarchy. A small circle meeting in secret called the Congress, decided its place of meeting, fixed its policy, framed its resolutions, selected its officers, governed its proceedings and took the opinion of the assembly by acclamation. The assembly listened to the speakers selected by the oligarchs and passed by acclamation the resolutions they had framed. The President was simply a temporary chief of the oligarchs and not the real head of a democratic assembly. In all these respects the Congress reproduced with extraordinary fidelity the essential features of a primitive Greek ecclesia or the Roman comitia in the most oligarchical period.

The first attempt to democratise the Congress was the creation of the Subjects Committee, as a sort of temporary Senate or Council which should prepare the business of the Congress. It was an unconscious reproduction of the Greek boule or preliminary Council which had similar functions; but it failed to democratise the Congress, it only widened the basis of the Congress oligarchy. It was supposed to be elected by the assembly but was really selected by the oligarchs whose nominations were accepted by the Congress. The Subjects Committee meetings were indeed the scene of frequent encounters between the oligarchs and the free lances who represented a growing strain of popular discontent; but there was no popular party which these men could set against the prestige of the old leaders, and they themselves were usually young and ambitious men who soon passed into the charmed circle and became its chief supports. Those of a robuster type, a Tilak or a Bepin Pal, were held at arm's length and, having no organised following, were unable to prevail.

Another direction in which the incipient democratic tendency sought to fulfil itself was in the demand for a fixed and written con titution for the Congress. Unwritten law administered by a coterie, class or caste, has always been a strength to oligarchy, and we find in early times that the first demand of an infant democracy is for the codification of law and a fixed and written constitution. We have ourselves experienced in the last two years what a powerful weapon in the hands of the Congress oligarchy h is been this absence of a written constitution, law and procedure for the Congress. The demand for a written constitution early manifested itself and led for some time to an actual secession of a whole Province from the Congress, but the privilege of administering the body without fixed or written restrictions was too highly valued by the official clique to be lightly parted with, and by procrastination and masterly inaction they succeeded in baffling the growing demand.

To democratise the Congress was, in fact, impossible without a popular awakening and widening of the political consciousness. Democracy is impossible without a demos, a people politically awake and active and it was only in the upheaval of 1905 that the rudiments of such a demos began to form. The Nationalist Party.which sprang out of that upheaval, showed its character by the democratic nature of its demands and the increasing tendency to democracy in its own composition. It demanded that the President should be elected according to popular sentiment and not by a coterie, that the Subjects Committee should be elected in due form and not nominated by a coterie, that the President and the Congress official circles should act constitutionally and not at their caprice or convenience, that the constitution should be reduced to writing, that the full assembly of delegates should be in fact as well as in theory the sovereign body and that the rights of discussion, amendment and rejection of resolutions should be allowed to be put in practice. In brief, they claimed that the theoretically democratic Congress should become democratic in effect and reality. The keenness of the struggle not only in the Congress but outside it has been largely if not principally due to this onslaught on the charmed oligarchical circle and

the determination of the latter to preserve their position at any cost. At Midnapur, for instance, the struggle was over this issue, and not over any serious difference of opinion. And though the issue at Surat was much larger and complicated, it is significant that the battle was joined over a question of constitutional procedure, and it was on a claim of the official oligarchy to override the constitutional rights of a delegate that the Surat Congress broke up in admired disorder. Oligarchy or democracy, authority or freedom are the issue, and no settlement can work which does not decide the question whether the Congress is to remain a mute assembly swayed by a handful of men or a democratic body of as modern a development as the political conditions of the country will allow.

SPIRITUALITY AND NATIONALISM

Mankind have a natural inclination to hero-worship and the great men who have done wonders for human civilisation will always be the inspiration of future ages. We are Hindus and naturally spiritual in our temperament, because the work which we have to do for humanity is a work which no other nation can accomplish, the spiritualisation of the race ; so the men whom we worship are those who have helped the spiritual progress of mankind. Without being sceptical no spiritual progress is possible, for blind adoration is only first stage in the spiritual development of the soul. We are wont to be spiritually sceptical, to hesitate to acknowledge to ourselves anything we have not actually experienced by the process of silent communion with God, so that the great stages of antiquity were as sceptical as any modern rationalist. They did away with all preconceived notions drawn from the religion of the Vedas, plunged into the void of absolute scepticism and tried to find there the Truth. They doubted everything, the evidence of the senses, the reality of the world, the reality of their own existence, and even the reality of God. This scepticism reached its culmination in the teachings of Buddha who would admit nothing, presuppose nothing, declare nothing dogmatically, and insisted only on self-discipline, self-communion, self-realisation as the only way to escape from the entanglement of the intellect and the senses. When scepticism had reached its height, the time had come for

spirituality to assert itself and establish the reality of the world as a manifestation of the spirit, the secret of the confusion created by the senses, the magnificent possibilities of man and the ineffable beatitude of God. This is the work whose consummation Sri Ramakrishna came to begin and all the development of the previous two thousand years and more since Buddha appeared has been a preparation for the harmonisation of spiritual teaching and experience by the Avatar of Dakshineshwar.

The long ages of discipline which India underwent are now drawing to an end. A great light is dawning in the East, a light whose first heralding glimpses are already seen on the horizon ; a new day is about to break, so glorious that even the last of the *avatars* cannot be sufficient to explain it although without him it would not have come. The perfect expression of Hindu spirituality was the signal for the resurgence of the East. Mankind has long been experimenting with various kinds of thought, different principles of ethics, strange dreams of a perfection to be gained by material means, impossible millenniums and humanitarian hopes. Nowhere has it succeeded in realising the ultimate secret of life. Nowhere has it found satisfaction. No scheme of society or politics has helped it to escape from the necessity of sorrow, poverty, strife, dissatisfaction from which it strives for an outlet ; for whoever is trying to find one by material means must inevitably fail. The East alone has some knowledge of the truth, the East alone can teach the West, the East alone can save mankind. Through all these ages Asia has been seeking for a light within, and whenever she has been blessed with a glimpse of what she seeks, a great religion has been born, Buddhism, Confucianism, Christianity, Mahomedanism with all their countless sects. But the grand workshop of spiritual experiment, the laboratory of the soul has been India, where thousands of great spirits have been born in every generation who were content to work quietly in their own souls, perfect their knowledge, hand down the results of their experiment to a few disciples and leave the rest to others to complete. They did not hasten to proselytise, were in no way eager to proclaim themselves, but merely added their quota of experience and returned to the source

from which they had come. The immense reservoir of spiritual energy stored up by the self-repression was the condition of this birth of *avataras*, of men so full of God that they could not be satisfied with silent bliss, but poured it out on the world, not with the idea of proselytising but because they wished to communicate their own ecstasy of realisation to others who were fit to receive it either by previous *tapasya* or by the purity of their desires. Of all these souls Sri Ramakrishna was the last and greatest, for while others felt God in a single or limited aspect, he felt Him in his illimitable unity as the sum of an illimitable variety. In him the spiritual experiences of the millions of saints who had gone before were renewed and united. Sri Ramkrishna gave to India the final message of Hinduism to the world. A new era dates from his birth, an era in which the peoples of the earth will be lifted for a while into communion with God and spirituality become the dominant note of human life. What Christianity failed to do, what Mahomedanism strove to accomplish in times as yet unripe, what Buddhism half accomplished for a brief period and among a limited number of men, Hinduism as summed up in the life of Sri Ramakrishna has to attempt for all the world. This is the reason of India's resurgence. this is why God has breathed life into her once more, why great souls are at work to bring about her salvation, why a sudden change is coming over the hearts of her sons. The movement of which the first outbreak was political, will end in a spiritual consummation.

THE NEW NATIONALISM*

The nicknames of party warfare have often passed into the accepted terminology used by serious politicians and perpetuated by history, and it is possible that the same immortality may await the designations of Moderates and Extremists by which the two parties now contending for the mind of the nation are commonly known. The forward party is the party of Nationalism ; but what is Nationalism ? For

*This article was produced as an exhibit in the Alipore Conspiracy Case and was first published in the *Hindusthan Standard* of August 14, 1938.

there is a great deal in a name in spite of Shakespeare. The word has only recently begun to figure as an ordinary term of our politics and it has been brought into vogue by the new, forward or extreme party, which, casting about for a convenient description of themselves, selected the new name as the only one covering in a word their temper and gospel as attached to a political party or school of thought. A name serves not only to show the temper and point of view of the giver, but it helps greatly to colour contemporary ideas about the party it seeks to exalt or disparage. The advanced men whom Anglo-Indian and Moderate unite in branding as Extremists have always repudiated the misleading designators. At first they preferred to call themselves the New School; they now claim the style of Nationalists, a claim which has been angrily objected to on the ground that the rest of the Congress Party are as good Nationalists as the forward party.

The new Nationalism, I said in a former article in this Review, is a negation of the old bourgeois ideals of the nineteenth century. It is an attempt to relegate the dominant bourgeois to his old obscurity, to transform the bourgeois into the Samurai and through him to extend the workings of the Samurai spirit to the whole nation, or to put it more broadly, it is an attempt to create a nation in India by reviving the spirit and action of the ancient Indian character, the strong, great and lofty spirit of old Aryavarta and setting it on fire, and mould the methods and materials of modernity for the freedom, greatness and well-being of an historic and immortal people. This is not, I am well aware, a description under which the ordinary Congress politician will recognise what he knows of desperate Extremism, but it will be well understood by those who are constant readers of the Nationalist journals in Bengal, whether the *Bande Mataram* or *New India* or vernacular journals like the *Yugantar*, the *Nabasakti*, or the *Sandhya*. Whatever their differences of temper or tone, however the methods they recommend may differ in detail, they are united by a common faith and a common spirit, a common faith in the Nationalism which existed in India before it became definite and articulate in Bengal. But it is Bengal that gave it a philosophy, a faith, a method and a battle-cry. India, not an

Anglicised and transmogrified nation unrecognisable as India, but an India of the immortal past, India of the clouded but fateful present, India mighty, crowned with the imperial diadem of the future, a common spirit of enthusiasm, hope, desire to demand all things so that our vision of her future may be fulfilled greatly and soon : this is the heart of Nationalism. The ordinary Congress politician's ideas of Nationalism are associated with wasted discussions in committee and Congress, altercations at public meetings, unsparing criticism of successful and eminent respectabilities, sedition trials, National volunteers, East Bengal disturbances, Rawalpindi riots. To him the Nationalist is nothing more than an Extremist, a violent, unreasonable, uncomfortable being whom some malign power has raised up to disturb with his Swaraj and boycott, his lawlessness and his lathis the respectable class and the safety of Congress politics. He finds him increasing in numbers and influence with an alarming rapidity which it is convenient to deny but impossible to ignore ; he has no clear idea of the aim and the drift of Extremism, but he imagines it to be its object to drive out the English and make India free by boycott and lathis, and having thus erected a scarecrow to chuck stones at, he thinks himself entitled to dismiss the New Party from his mind as a crowd of enthusiasts who talk nonsense and advocate impossibilities.

Nationalism cannot be so easily dismissed ; a force which has shaken the whole of India, trampled the traditions of a century into a refuse of irrecoverable fragments and set the mightiest of modern empires groping in a panic for weapons strong enough to meet a new and surprising danger, must have some secret of strength and therefore of truth in it which is worth knowing. To get at the heart of Nationalism we must first clear away some of the conceptions with which its realities have been clouded. We must know what Nationalism is not, before we ask what it is.

Extremism in the sense of unreasoning violence of spirit and the preference of desperate methods, because they are desperate, is not the heart of Nationalism. The Nationalist does not advocate lawlessness for its own sake; on the

contrary, he has deeper respect for the essence of the law than anyone else, because the building up of a nation is his objective and he knows well that without a profound reverence for law a national life cannot persist and attain a sound and healthy development. But he qualifies his respect for legality by the proviso that the law he is called upon to obey is the law of the nation, an outgrowth of the organic existence and part of its Government. A law imposed from outside can command only the obedience of those whose chief demand from life is the safety to their persons and property, or the timid obedience of those who understand the danger of breaking the law. The claim made by it is an utilitarian, not a moral claim. Farther, the Nationalist never loses sight of the truth that law was made for man and not man for law. Its chief function and reason for existence is to safeguard and foster the growth and happy flowering into strength and health of National life. And a law which does not subserve this end or which opposes and contradicts the same however rigidly it may enforce peace, or order and security, forfeits its claim to respect and obedience. Nationalism refuses to accept law as a fetish or peace and security as an aim in themselves ; the only idol of its worship is Nationality and the only aim it in itself recognises is the freedom, power, and well-being of the Nation. It will not prefer violent or strenuous methods simply because they are violent or strenuous, but neither will it cling to mild and peaceful methods simply because they are mild and peaceful. It asks of a method whether it is effective for its purpose, whether it is worthy of a great people struggling to be, whether it is educative of national strength and activity ; and these things ascertained, it asks nothing farther. The Nationalist does not love anarchy and suffering for their own sake, but if anarchy and suffering are the necessary passage to the great consummation he seeks, he is ready to bear them himself, to expose others to them till the end is reached. They will embrace suffering of their children, and embrace suffering as a lover and clasp the hand of anarchy like that of a trusted friend. It is not the temper of the Nationalist to take the inevitable grudgingly or to serve or struggle with a half heart. If that is Extremism and fanaticism, he is an Extremist and a fanatic ; but not for their

own sake, not out of a disordered love for anarchy and turmoil, not in madness and desperation but out of a reasoned conviction and courageous acceptance of the natural love by which a man who aspires to reach a difficult height must climb up the steep rocks and risk life and limb in arduous places, that have decreed that men who desire to live as free men in a free country must not refuse to be ready to pay toll for freedom with their own blood, the blood of their children, and still more, the nation which seeks to grow out of subjection into liberty must consent first to manure the soil with the tears of its women and the bodies of its sons. The Nationalist knows what he asks from fate and he knows the price that fate asks from him in return. Knowing it he is ready to drag the nation with him into the valley of the shadow of death, dark with night and mist and storm, sown thick and crude with perils of strange monsters and perils of morass and fire and flood, holding all danger and misery as nothing because beyond the valleys are the mountains of Beulah, where the nation shall enjoy eternal life. He is ready to lead the chosen people into the desert of long wanderings though he knows that often in the bitterness of its sufferings it will murmur and rebel against his leadership and raise its hand to stone him to death as the author of its misery, for he knows that beyond is the promised land flowing with milk and honey which, the divine voice has told him, those who are faithful will reach and possess. If he embraces anarchy, it is as the way to good government. If he does not shrink from disorder and violent struggle it is because without that disorder there can be no security and without that struggle no peace, except the security of decay and the peace of death. If he has sometimes to disregard the law of man, it is to obey the dictates of his conscience and the law of God.

'SWARAJ' AND THE MUSULMANS

We extract in our columns this week the comments of Srijut Bepin Chandra Pal's organ, *Swaraj*, on the Government's pro-Mahomedan policy and its possible effects in the future. We are glad to see this great Nationalist again expressing his views with his usual orginality and fine political insight. We do not ourselves understand the utility of such a campaign as Srijut Bepin Chandra is carrying

on in England. In politics quite as much as in ordinary conduct the rule of *desh-kal patra*, the right place, the right time and the right person, conditions the value and the effectiveness of the work. For Bepin Babu's mission there could not be a worse place than England, a worse time than the present and a worse audience than the British people. What is the prophet of self-help and dissociation doing in England ? Or what kind of message is this that he carries to the British public, "We do not welcome your favours, we reject your help and sympathy and will have no political association with you until Swaraj is ours,—and therefore I am here speaking to you and publishing my views to a British audience in London" ? We can only suppose that Bepin Babu does really imagine he can produce some kind of effect worth having, moral if not substantial, upon the ruling nation, and if so what does it portend ? Is Saul also among the prophets ? Does Bepin too stand in the doorway of Britannia ?

The first three or four issues of *Swaraj* disappointed our expectations. A sense of the unreality of his position seemed to haunt the writer and robbed his writing of the former strength and close touch with the subject. It was the old views, the familiar thought, the well-known manner, but it neither convinced, illuminated nor inspired. This month's *Swaraj* is more confident and effective, although the thing still seems to be in the air. The passage extracted and the admirable character-sketch of Srijut Shyamsunder Chakrabarti are the best things in the issue. Bepin Babu seems to have recovered the copious vein of thought, the subtle and flexible reasoning, the just and original view of his subject which made one wait with impatience for every fresh number of *New India*. His attitude towards the Reform scheme and the Mahomedan demand for a separate electorate is the attitude which has consistently been adopted by the Nationalist party in Bengal towards the Hindu-Mahomedan question in ordinary politics. We do not fear Mahomedan opposition ; so long as it is the honest Swadeshi article and not manufactured in Shillong or Simla, we welcome it as a sign of life and aspiration. We do not shun, we desire the awakening of Islam in India even if its first crude efforts are misdirected against ourselves ; for all

strength, all energy, all action is grist to the mill of the nation-builder. In that faith we are ready, when the time comes for us to meet in the political field, to exchange with the Musulman, just as he chooses, the firm clasp of the brother or the resolute grip of the wrestler.

That time has not yet come. There is absolutely no reason why the electoral question should create bad blood between the two communities, for if we leave aside the limited number who still hunger after loaves and fishes or nurse dead delusions, the reforms have no living interest for the Hindu. His field of energy lies elsewhere than in the enlarged pretences of British Liberalism. His business is to find out his own strength and prepare it for a great future, and the less he meddles with unreal politics and nerveless activities, the better for the nation. The Mahomedan has not progressed so far. He has to taste the sweets of political privilege and find them turn to ashes in his mouth. He has to formulate demands, rejoice at promises, fume at betrayals, until he thoroughly discovers the falsity and impossibility of his hopes. His progress is likely to be much swifter than ours has been in the past, for he gets the advantage if not of our experience, at least of the ideas now in the air and of the more bracing and stimulating atmosphere. He is more likely to demand than to crave, and his disillusionment must necessarily be the speedier. And it is then that he too will seek the strength in himself and touch the true springs of self-development. Our best policy is to leave the Mahomedan representatives on the councils to work out their destiny face to face with the bureaucracy, with no weightier Hindu counterpoise than the effete politicians, the time-servers and the self-seekers.

Of one thing we may be certain, that Hindu-Mahomedan unity cannot be effected by political adjustments or Cougress flatteries. It must be sought deeper down, in the heart and in the mind, for where the causes of disunion are, there the remedies must be sought. We shall do well in trying to solve the problem to remember that misunderstanding is the most fruitful cause of our differences, that love compels love and that strength conciliates the strong. We must strive to remove the

causes of misunderstanding by a better mutual knowledge and sympathy ; we must extend the unfaltering love of the patriot to our Musulman brother, remembering always that in him too Narayana dwells and to him too our Mother has given a permanent place in her bosom ; but we must cease to approach him falsely or flatter out of a selfish weakness and cowardice. We believe this to be the only practical way of dealing with the difficulty. As a political question the Hindu-Mahomedan problem does not interest us at all, as a national problem it is of supreme importance. We shall make it a main part of our work to place Mahomed and Islam in a new light before our readers, to spread juster views of Mahomedan history and civilisation, to appreciate the Musulman's place in our national development and the means of harmonising his communal life with our own, not ignoring the difficulties that stand in our way for making the most of the possibilities of brotherhood and mutual understanding. Intellectual sympathy can only draw together, the sympathy of the heart can alone unite. But the one is a good preparation for the other.

THE PARTY OF REVOLUTION

Be the fault whose you will, ours or the Government's, the existence of an organised party of armed Revolution in Indian politics is now a recognised factor of the situation. The enormous strides with which events have advanced and a sky full of trouble but also of hope been overcast and grown full of gloom and menace, can be measured by the rapidity with which this party has developed. It is only five years since the national movement sprang into being. The cry was then for self-help and passive resistance. Boycott, Swadeshi, Arbitration, National Education, were the hope of the future, the means of self-regeneration. In five years everything has been struck to the earth. Boycott has almost disappeared, Swadeshi languishes under sentence of arrest, Arbitration died still-born, National Education is committing suicide. A tremendous disintegration has taken place and we look amazed on the ruins of the work our labour and our sacrifice erected. It is a huge defeat, an astonishing catastrophe. And on those ruins grim, wild-eyed, pitiless to itself and to others, mocking at death and defeat

with its raucous and careless laughter. Revolution rises repeating the language of the old-world insurgents, cherishing a desperate hope which modern conditions deny, grasping at the weapons which the Slav and the Celt have brought into political warfare. The seeds which the *Yugantar* sowed in its brief, violent and meteoric career have borne fruit in unexpected quarters and new-born journals repeat in foreign lands and in the English tongue the incitations to revolt and slaughter which have been put down by the strong hand in India of the law Money is forthcoming to support a journalism which must obviously be all cost and no profit, young men exile themselves from their native land by openly joining the party of violence and in India itself repeated blows have been struck paralysing the hope and the effort to revive the activity of that broader and calmer Nationalism which, recognising modern conditions, still commands the allegiance of the bulk of the nation.

Its Growth : What is the precise nature, propaganda and strength of this party, which by so small an expenditure of energy has produced such surprising results ? When the *Yugantar*, abandoning its habit of philosophic Revolutionism, first began to enter the field of practical politics, to sneer at passive resistance and gird at its chief exponents, no one thought that its change of attitude portended anything serious. Men read the paper for the amazing brilliance, grace and sustained force of its style, a new thing in Bengali journalism, and from the natural attraction men feel for strong writing and bold thought even when they do not agree with it. Afterwards the reckless fight of the *Yugantar* for existence attracted a more dangerous admiration and from that time the journal changed from a thing of literary interest into a political force. Even then it was taken as a practical guide only among a section of young men small in numbers and without means or influence. But things have changed since then. A void has been created by the conviction, deportation, self-imposed exile or silence of the great Nationalist speakers, writers, organisers, and the dangerous opinions and activities then created have rushed in to occupy the vacuum. The Nationalism we advocate is a thing difficult to grasp and follow, needing continual

intellectual exposition to keep its hold on the mind, continual inspiration and encouragement to combat the impatience natural to humanity; its methods are comparatively new in politics and can only justify themselves to human conservatism by distinguished and sustained success. The preaching of the new revolutionary party is familiar to human imagination, supported by the records of some of the most inspiring episodes in history, in consonance with the impatience, violence and passion for concrete results which revolutionary epochs generate. The growing strength of this party is not difficult to explain; it is extremely difficult to combat.

Its Exent : This party has two sides, the propaganda carried on in foreign countries, and the Terrorist activiiy always recrudescent in our midst. The latter is the more formidable in the present, the former the more dangerous in the future. The foreign propaganda was first located in London and confined to the single paper, the *Indian Sociologist*, first an organ of Shyamji Krishnavarma's Home Rule Society and opposed to all methods of violence. The conversion of Krishnavarma to the Terrorism he once fiercely condemned, has been a very important factor in the growth of the new party. The propaganda has been driven from London only to spring at once into an ubiquitous activity abroad. From Paris Krishnavarma publishes the *Indian Sociologist*; from Berlin a new organ, significantly self-styled the *Talwar*, issues; in Geneva a paper naming itself the *Bande Mataram* busies itself with decrying the policy of the defunct *Bande Mataram* and denouncing its originator and former Editor; a paper called the *Free Hindustan* maintains itself in America. Wealthy men and women stand behind these organs, the Kathiawar Krishnavarma, the Parsi lady Mrs. Kama and possibly others who do not adverties their names. Young men of all nationalities in India seem to have joined these organisations and occasional pamphlets find their way into India in spite of the vigilance of the Post Office by means familiar to European revolutionism. In India any violent propaganda is impossible; violent action takes its place and the swift succession of attempted or successful outrages in Gujarat, Maharashtra, Punjab and Bengal show that if the movement is not organised,

as in these foreign countries, it is equally widespread. The very existence of such a conspiracy must paralyse all other forms and methods of national aspiration by driving the Government and the Anglo-Indian community into the suppression of everything that goes beyond contented acceptance of that which exists. The revolutionists know this well and they have played their game with great skill and success.

Ourselves : Every established Government is bound to eradicate a movement of this kind and it will naturally use any means it thinks effective. We recognise this necessity, but we have no faith in the means the Government and the Anglo-Indians seem to favour. We are dead against covering over an evil by pretentions, sounding and hollow speech and measures ; we do not believe in a remedial system which suppresses symptoms and leaves the roots untouched. All we can do is to stand aside and let the physician try his system—and this we propose to do from henceforward. We have written this week in order to explain our action and our attitude, but we shall abstain in future from comment on current Indian politics or criticism of Government and its measures until more favourable and normal conditions return. We only reserve to ourselves the liberty of writing once to point out the immense difference between Indian conditions in modern times and the historical precedents on which the revolutionists rely,—for which we had not sufficient space in this issue. With this exception the rest is silence. The *Karmayogin* was originally started as a weekly review intended to encourage the habit of deep and close thinking on all subjects and widen the intellectual range of the people, giving an especial importance to religion and the growth of spirituality. The disproportionate space allowed to current politics was necessitated by the absence of any political organ devoted to that propaganda of peaceful Nationalism in which we saw the only way to healthy political development in India. Now that the way is barred by the legislator and the Terrorist, we return to our original intention.

3

LALA LAJPAT RAI

[Also known as the 'Lion of Punjab', Lala Lajpat Rai (1865-1928) occupies the first place in the trio of Lal, Bal, Pal, the other two being Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Bipin Chandra Pal. Influenced by the ideas of Mazzini, the prophet, and the actions of Garribaldi, the warrior of Italian nationalism, he desired to prosecute Indian nationalist movement on the lines of extremism. Though a leading figure of the Arya Samaj movement and an important member of the Hindu Maha Sabha, he ever adhered to the path of secularism. In very strong terms he criticised the communal approach of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. His *Unhappy India* came as a bold and crushing reply to Catherine Mayo's *Mother India*. In 1988 he attended the Allahabad Congress and since then his career as a Congressman started. In 1905 with Gokhale he visited England to persuade the British leaders not to go ahead with the proposed partition of Bengal. In 1907 he was deported to Mandalay (Burma) that made him a national figure. He associated himself with the Ghadar Party founded by Lala Har Dayal in California (USA) in 1913. In 1916 his *Young India* appeared that condemned the line of the Moderates and instead appreciated the ways of the Extremists for the achievement of Swaraj. He presided over the Special Congress session held at Calcutta in September, 1920. On this occasion Gandhiji's resolution on non-violent non-cooperation was adopted. Lalaji was not in agreement with Gandhi's method of non-violence. He founded Tilak School of Politics and Servants of People Society. Through these bodies and also through his papers *The Punjabee* and *The Bande Matram* (in Urdu) and *The People*

(in English) he spread the message of Swaraj In 1923 he ioined the Swaraj Party of C.R. Das ard entered the Central Legislative Assembly on its ticket. But he left it and then with M.M. Malaviya he formed National its Party. In 1928 he took part in the boycott of Simon Commission. The police lathi-charge on the demonstrators caused him serious injuries and that became the cause of his martyrdom.]

OPEN LETTERS TO SIR SYED AHMED KHAN*

I

Would you excuse me if I encroach upon your valuable time for a short while? Before I address you on the subject-matter of discussion, I think it advisable to state for your information that I have been a constant reader and admirer of your writings. From childhood, I was taught to respect the opinions and the teachings of the white-bearded Syed of Aligarh. Your *Social Reformer* was constantly read to me by my fond father, who looked upon you as no less than a prophet of the nineteenth century. Your writings in the *Aligarh Institute Gazette* and your speeches in Council and other public meetings, were constantly studied by me and preserved as a sacred trust by my revered parent. It was thus that I came to know that you once approved of the contents of John Stuart Mill's book on "Liberty," and it was thus that I came to know (if my memory does not deceive me) that the present Chief Justice of Hyderabad, a staunch opponent of the National Movement, once translated Jeremy Bentham's book on "Utility" for the readers of your *Social Reformer*. Is it strange then that I have been astonished to read what you now speak and write about the "National Congress"? Any person, in my circumstances,

*The 'Open Letters' originally appeared in the Urdu Weekly *Kohi-Noor* of Lahore. These were translated into English shortly before the Allahabad Session of the Indian National Congress in 1888 that was attended by Lala Lajpat Rai. At the suggestion of Allan Octavian Hume, the 'Open Letters' were reproduced in a pamphet and distributed among the delegates The letters were written after Sir Syed Ahmed Khan had openly started a campaign against the Congress and advised his co-religionists to remain aloof from it.

would shout out. Times have changed and with them convictions ! Flattery and official cajoleries have blinded the eyes of the most far-seeing; cowardice has depressed the souls of the foremost of seekers after truth, and high sounding titles and the favours of worldly governors have extinguished the fire of truth burning in many a noble heart. It is not a sad spectacle to the men whose days are numbered, whose feet are almost in the grave, trying to root out all the trees planted with their own hands !

Under these circumstances, Syed Sahib, it is, surely, not strange if I ask what has been the cause of this lamentable change in you. Old age and exhaustion of faculties may, perhaps, have some share in causing you to forget what you once wrote and spoke. Has your memory lost its retentiveness, or is it the blindness of dotage which has permitted you to stray into your present unhappy position ?

If the former, I from amongst your old admirers will take upon myself the duty of reminding you of what, in moments of wisdom, was recorded and published by your pen and tongue, and this duty, I promise, I will fulfil with the utmost pleasure and with feelings of the highest satisfaction.

I will begin with your book on the "Causes of the Indian Revolt", which was written in 1858, though only translated and published in English in the year 1873. It may be worth while to note here that the translators of this were no others than Sir Auckland Colvin, the present Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces, and Lieutenant-Colonel Graham, the writer of your biography. In this book, after having tried to prove that the Mutiny of 1857 was no "religious war," nor the result of a preconcerted conspiracy, you say that "most men, I believe, agree in thinking that it is highly conducive to the welfare and prosperity of Government—indeed, that it is essential to its stability—that the people should have a voice in its Councils. It is from the voice of the people that Government can learn whether its projects are likely to be well received. The voice of the people can alone check errors in the bud and warn us of dangers before they burst upon and destroy us." To make

the matter more clear you go on saying that "this voice, however, can never be heard, and this security never acquired, unless the people are allowed a share in the consultations of Government. The security of a government, it will be remembered, is founded on its knowledge of the character of the governed as well as on its careful observance of their rights and privileges." These are noble words, noble spoken ; words of sterling honesty and independence of spirit. Can they bear any other meaning than that which attaches to that resolution of the National Congress which prays for the introduction of a representative element into the constitution of our Legislative Councils ? Pray, tell me how can the people have a voice in the Councils of a Government if not by representation ? How can the people of a country have their voice constantly heard if not through representatives ? But, to leave no doubt on the subject, I will go on giving quotations in proof of my assertion, that you have yourself in former times strongly advocated the introduction of a representative element into the Legislative Councils of India. After laying much stress upon the necessity of a Government respecting the opinions of the people it governs, you say : "The evils which resulted to India from the non-admission of natives into the Legislative Councils of India were various...... It (*i.e.* the Government) could never hear, as it ought to have heard, the voice of the people on the laws and regulations which it passed." Again you say : "But the greatest mischief lay in this, that the people misunderstood the views and the intentions of the Government. They misapprehended every act." After this you proceed to say that "if Hindustanis had been in the Legislative Councils, they would have explained everything to their countrymen, and thus these evils which have happened to us would have been averted." In your opinion, as expressed there, this non-representation of the voice of the governed in the Legislative Council of the realm was "the one great cause" and the "origin of all smaller causes of dissatisfaction." Nay, further, not to leave any doubts in the matter, and to prove that in your book you even go to the length of saying that your countrymen should be selected to form an assembly like the English Parliament (which demand, at the time you advanced it, was certainly more premature than it now is, though the National Congress, with all the advantages that the

country has had in the way of education and enlightenment since that miserable year of 1858, only advocates the partial introduction of a representative element in the Legislative Councils), I shall give some more extracts from the same work.

There you say : "I do not wish to enter here into the question as to how the ignorant and uneducated natives of Hindustan could be allowed a share in the deliberations of the Legislative Council, or as to how they should be selected to form an assembly like the English Parliament. These are knotty points. All I wish to prove is that such a step is not only advisable but absolutely necessary, and that the disturbances are due to the neglect of such a measure." Could clearer words be used than what have been quoted above ? Is there any doubt as to their meaning ? Because if so, I shall be obliged to quote the exact Hindustani words used by you to express the ideas propounded in the above lines. But no, I do not suppose you can feel any doubt on that point, because the English rendering was undertaken by no others than Sir Auckland Colvin and Lieutenant-Colonel Graham, the former of whom, at least, is now being proclaimed (whether rightly or wrongly, God knows) as an opponent of the National Congress.

Sir Syed, does it not sound strange that the writer of the words above quoted should put himself forward as the leader of the anti-Congress movement ? Is it not one more proof of India's misfortune that the writer of the above words should impute bad motives to the supporters of the National Congress, mainly because they advocate the introduction of some sort of representation in the Legislative Councils of India ? Is not your charge of sedition against the promoters of the Congress, in the face of these, a mere mockery, a contradiction in terms ? Thirty years ago, you advocated the institution of a Parliament, and yet you chide us saying that we want an Indian Parliament, notwithstanding that we protest that for the present, and for a long time to come, we do not claim any such thing ? Mark the difference. India is no longer what it was thirty years ago. In the course of this period it has made a marked advance towards a higher civilization. The natives of India are no longer, with *very* few exceptions, ignorant or uneducated. The

rays of education are penetrating and shedding their wholesome light inside most Indian homes ; hundreds of thousands of Indians are as well educated as any average English gentleman, and we see scores of our countrymen every year crossing the "black waters" to witness with their own eyes the proceedings of the great British Parliament and personally familiarize themselves with the political institutions of the English nation. Can you, in the face of these facts, still call us "seditious" ? According to your writings, we are the most loyal subjects of the Government, and if, notwithstanding what you have written, you still deserve to be called ' the ablest of our loyal Mahomedan gentlemen," why, we deserve not to be styled "as the ablest of the most loyal subjects of the English Government."

To give a still more clear idea of what you thought about the fitness of India for this sort of Government, I give one more extract to the point, and then I will have done with your old writings for the present. After giving many arguments in proof of your position that the law which allowed the sales of land for arrears of Government revenue was also a cause of the outbreak of disturbances in 1858, you say : "A landed estate in Hindustan is very like a kingdom. It has always been the practice to elect one man as the head over all. By him matters requiring discussion are 'brought forward' (mind, not decided), and every shareholder, in proportion to his holding has the power of speaking out his mind on the point." You are wrong when you say "in proportion to his holding." However, let it remain as it is You proceed and say : "The cultivators and the choudhries of the villages attend on such an occasion and say whatever they have to say. You have here, in great perfection a miniature kingdom parliament." How is it that now you have changed your mind and have come to opine that these kingdoms, as you called them, should have no voice in the making of laws which materially affect the person, the property and the reputation of the people ?

Some persons insinuate that these writings, which I have quoted, came from an honest, uncorrupted mind, at a time when the writer had no prospect of being raised to the Legislative Council by mere favour. No, Sir Syed, no ! I, on my own

part, do not want to make such an insinuation against the fearless writer of those noble words which have been quoted above.

Then the problem to be solved remains the same, *viz*, why this change, why this inconsistency? I pause for a reply, with a promise of more in my next, and in the meanwhile beg to be allowed to subscribe myself,

The Son of an old Follower of
Yours*

27th October, 1888

II

It is more than two weeks now since my first letter was published, and I think, I have waited long enough for the reply which, it seems, you have no mind to send. However, in fulfilment of my promise, I am bound to go on giving quotation after quotation, bringing home to you your own former political teachings, and I hope I shall be able clearly to prove that you once believed in all the principles upon which the different Resolutions of the National Congress are based. This will leave you no alternative but either an open and unreserved confession of your apostacy or an unreserved retreat from politics.

Do not think, Sir Syed, that I shall rest satisfied with the publication of these letters in India. No, they will be duly published and distributed in free England, side by side with the pamphlets of your own pet Association of yesterday.

In the book, already so often referred to, *i.e.* "The Causes of the Indian Revolt," you say: "Government were but slightly acquainted with the unhappy state of the people. How could it well be otherwise? There was no real communication between the Government and the governed, no living together or near one another, as has always been the custom of Mahomedans in countries which they subjected to their rule. Government and its officials have never adopted the course without which no real knowledge of the people can be gained." Further

*Munshi Radhakrishna, the father of Lala Lajpat Rai, was an admirer of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan.

on you say that "this cannot be expected from the English, as they almost all look forward to retirement in their land, and seldom settle for good amongst the natives of India."

Now I take the liberty of asking has there been any improvement of late in this direction? Have the majority, or even one per cent of the retired English officers, permanently settled in India? On the contrary, we find that they are birds-of-passage just as much now as, or perhaps more, than they were when the above sentences were written. Then, have the Englishmen and the natives taken to living together, or near one another? Do you ever see Englishmen living in the Mohallas of your towns, however large the towns or however respectable the Mohallas may be? None of the Englishmen have ever been seen doing that. In fact, their mode of living is so peculiar that they cannot. Or, do you think that the point has been gained by a few Anglicised natives like yourself having taken to living in bungalows? If that is what you argue, I assure you, you are sadly mistaken. Your living in Europeanized houses cannot be said to be a gain to native society. It is rather, if I may be allowed to say so, a very severe and deplorable loss. In the sentence quoted above, you admit that living together or near one another enhances our sympathies and gives us more occasions of seeing, mixing with, and obtaining a more intimate knowledge of each other. It is thus clear that Europeans can only really know us if they see us in our native homes, in our small thatched huts full of misery and sickness. How poor and miserable India is, they can feel only if they live amongst or near the houses of our agriculturists, and there see with their own eyes respectable native families sleeping in rooms into which an English beggar would scorn to step. Why is this? Is it because we Indians do not know how to live? Now, if you say that, go to those Indian residences which are occupied by our few rich or even well-to do countrymen, and there you will find that our mode of living is quite on a par with that of Europeans. Does any one then ask how it is that I say that respectable natives live, everywhere, in buildings which can only properly be called hovels? The answer is, because they are miserably poor and cannot afford to build comfortable houses. Taxation is so high that they never feel

themselves secure of their respectability. In fact, that is always in danger. The poor fellows are daily and nightly engaged in making the two ends meet. What I mean to say is that the fact of you or a few other natives having to live in bungalows and imitating the English customs of eating and drinking and dressing cannot do any good either to India or to England. In fact, this will never help the English to realize the unhappy state of the people. Then the question is, how can the Government know the wants and wishes of its subjects ? They cannot know them through official reports, because these reports are almost all prepared by persons who seldom see the real state of the people whom the reports concern. You yourself said : "But even these officials themselves were ignorant of the real thoughts and opinions of the people, because they had no means of getting at them" (*vide* your Biography by Colonel Graham, p. 49.) Then can the Government get this knowledge through the petitions of their subjects ? I say, as you said, *no*. You said that these petitions "were," and I say they *are*, "seldom if ever attended to and sometimes never heard" (*vide* the same page of your Biography). I add to this that even if they are ever attended to, enquiry into the allegations made in them is often entrusted to the same officials whose conduct forms the subject of complaint. Their reports are taken to be gospel truth and the petitions are thrown out.

Then, can the Government know the real opinion of the people through the Native press ? No, because the Government officials have always been hostile to it, and have ever asserted that these papers represented nobody but themselves.

Public meetings even are not effectual, because these are invariably declared to be the work of professional agitators, stump orators and wire-pullers.

The question then is, that admitting as you do, that it is essential for the purpose of good administration that the people should have a voice in the consultations of the Government, how should that voice reach the Council Chambers, and how should the people be consulted before laws are passed ? You once said that "laws affecting the subjects should be made after consultation with the representatives of the people" (*vide Social*

Reformer of the 15th Shawwal 1290, Hijri, equivalent to the (th December, 1873, p. 163), and there cannot be any other answer to this question. Further on you said : "I am very sorry that this is not being done in India, and in not doing so Government is in error to a certain degree, but in a larger measure it is owing to the incompetency of the subjects, but I am confident that after a certain period—sufficient education will remove both" (*Vide* the same Journal, same page). It is fifteen years now, Sir, since above lines were written, and it is, surely, time to ask, or, at least, to consider, whether that period, or *chand roz*, to speak in your own words, has not expired yet. I am ready to concede, though it may be for argument's sake only that the period has not expired, but are we not making steady progress towards the desired end ? Your objections, unfortunately, are not based upon considerations of time, but are put forward as matters of principle. Then admitting, as you do, that this voice can only reach the Council Chamber through the representatives of the people, the only question to be solved is—who should be those representatives, or, in other words, how should they acquire that position ? Can men, like Raja Shiva Prashad and yourself, be properly considered as representatives of the people, and can the method of selection, by which you were sent to the Council Chamber, be accepted as of any value ? I think no reasonable man would contend that it would have been possible, if Raja Shiva Prashad had been an elected representative of the people of India, for him to have libelled the whole Indian nation, as he did, in his notorious speech on the Ilbert Bill. Could Raja Peary Mohan Mukerjee and other native members have consented to the raising of the Salt tax if they had thought that their seats depended on the voices of the people, whose throats were, so to speak, to be cut by that obnoxious and inhumane measure ? Then the correct solution is this and no other, that the people must be represented by delegates, elected by themselves ; and subject of course to the restrictions to be imposed by the Government. Co-sharers in the business of governing or legislating, these representatives must be such as to be totally independent of official favour or disfavour. If the selection of members for the Legislative Council is to be entrusted to

officials, I say it is a downright farce, and there can be no representation.

The majority of the quotations given above come from a book which was written about thirty years ago, and you may find an excuse by saying that the state of people has since then undergone a mighty change, and that, in consequence of this, the remedies then suggested are no longer suitable. My dear Sir, this reply cannot stand a moment's examination. I am going to show that in 1881, which is only seven years ago, you held the same views and felt rather proud of them. When it was proposed to raise the old Punjab University College to the status of a University, you were one of the foremost opponents of the proposal. You, your admirers and followers, should not have forgotten that you wrote certain articles under the heading "Our Vernacular," and got them published and circulated in a pamphlet form. These articles were published in almost all the leading vernacular papers of Northern India, and the educated community of the Punjab, who were strongly opposed to the establishment of a University on the lines suggested by Dr. Leitner, obtained effective support from these writings of "the ablest of the loyal Mahomedan gentlemen." In one of them (paper 2nd perhaps), which was published in your *Social Reformer* for 1297-98 Hijri (equivalent to 1881), at p. 135, you say : "National progress and National Government are both sisters born of the same mother. When a nation loses its independence, its progress only depends upon its learning the language and sciences of Conquerors and thus taking a part in the Government of the country. By way of flattery whatever may be said, and as a matter of policy whatever may be stated, the fact is that *in reality the relations of Hindustanis to their rulers are no bett r than those of slaves to their master*" The italics are mine. I have tried to give a faithful translation of your Urdu sentences. If I have erred, I hope to be excused, and that my mistake may be pointed out. However, to satisfy the scruples of sceptical readers, I prefer to give the last portion of the sentence in Roman characters and leave them to judge for themselves whether the rendering is correct or not. The original words are : *Khushamad ki baten jo chahe kah le, aur political tarikh men jo kuchh beyan karna ho, keya jawe,*

magar Hindostanion ka hal apni fatahmand quam ke sath gulami ke halat se kuchh ziyada nohin hai. In the same article, further on, you said that the "University College was being raised to the status of a University with the object of throwing obstacles in the way of our National advancement, and that the result of the clamour after Oriental studies could be nothing but that of keeping ourselves in the state of serfdom."

Sir Syed, would you still call us "seditious"? Remember that we are the product of that education which you so strongly recommended and which you have never been known to condemn. Our English education, the study of eminent European minds and European sciences—alas ! that you cannot feel this—has expanded our souls, and we can no longer be selfish "Sat Bachnia" prodigies of your Oriental language. Sir, your fall seems to remind me of the fall of Adam. Just as Satan is said to be the cause of the fall of that progenitor of our race, this seeking after worldly honours seems to be real explanation of your decline. It is nothing to you, because your term in this world must at no very distant period expire ; but to us, who are yet, we hope, to live long and to fight out the bloodless battle of liberty, it is destined to remain a permanent disgrace The line of argument against us would be that the races which produce such inconsistent philosphers are not fit to receive the boon of Local Self-Government. Sir Syed, if you have changed your political opinions, the sooner you announce it the better it will be, both for yourself and for us. It is simply childish to persist in your claim to consistency in the face of the above quotations. Better announce this change and explain why and how this took place. Again pausing for a reply, with a promise of more in my next, I beg to subscribe myself.

The Son of an old Follower
of Yours

15th November 1888

III

Well may we apply the opening sentence of Dickens' *Tale of Two Cities* to the present times in India. Well may we say that

it is "the best of times" as well as "the worst of times" Best as the country is on the point of having a nation, worst as a particular section of the community wants to check the progress of the country and unfortunately is headed, or at least is said to be headed by a man who has been a frequent advocate of representative Government in India. It is "the age of wisdom" as the country has risen from its deep lethargy and made up its mind to assess the Government by wise counsels. It is "the age of foolishness as a particular party has the audacity to believe that their composition will cause the national movement to die in its infancy. It is "the epoch of belief" because the different sectional interest have begun to believe in each other's sincerity ; it is "the epoch of incredulity" because you, Sir, are said to be now-a-days against the introduction of a representative element into the Legislative Councils of India. It is the "spring of hope" when we see eminent English statesmen advocating the rights of the dumb millions of India. It is the "winter of despair" when we see her own sons deserting the cause of awakened India.

Sir Syed, I must remind you that it is the same India for the welfare of whose sons you established "The Siddor's Union Club" at Aligarh. Do you remember, Sir, that in that Club alumni of the Mahomedan College were trained in the art of discussing public matters in public councils ? I ask you, Sir why you established that Club ? Why did you formulate those rules of discussion which predict the establishment of representative institutions in the country ? Oh, if we had only known that it was to end in this ! I feel that I have gone astray and must look at those extracts from your writings and sayings so dear to me, which foretold the establishment of representative Councils in India.

Will you please turn to page 49 of your Biography by Lieutenant-Colonel Graham where you are described as saying : "The people were isolated, they had no champion to stand up for the rights and to see justice done them, and they were constrained to weep in silence." Can you in the face of these words still say that the people never needed such champions, and that the Government has been doing and will go on doing

without demand what it has thought and what it will think necessary for the welfare of the people? That it never needed the voice of such champions for the redress of grievances and the attainment of rights ?

Having pointed out what the Government ought to have done to make itself popular (quotations as to which have been given in letters Nos. I and II) you said in the end of the same book, "The Causes of Indian Revolt," that "it was necessary for the Government to win the friendship and the good feeling of its subjects." Farther on you said : "As yet, truth compels me to state, Government has not cultivated the friendship of its people as was its duty to do......the father loves his child before the child loves him... . If a man of low degree tries to win the esteem of one in high position, he is liable to be styled a flatterer and not a friend. It was, therefore, for Government to try and win the friendship of its subjects, not for the subjects to try and win that of the Government......If Government say that what I say is untrue—that they have tried to cnltivate friendship and have only been repaid with enmity—I can only say that if it had gone the right way to work, its subjects would most undoubtedly have been its friends and supporters instead of, as in many instances, rising up in arms against it. Now, friendship is a feeling which springs from the heart and which cannot be kindled by 'admonitions'......Government has hitherto kept itself as isolated from the people of India as if it had been the fire and they the dry grass—as if it thought that, were the two brought in contact, the latter would be burnt up."

I have given this large quotation to recall to your mind some of the reasons upon which you formed the opinions which I have already quoted in my letters Nos. I and II. These reasons may also go to prove that the prayers of the National Congress as to the concession of volunteering to be allowed to the native subjects of Her Majesty are nothing but reasonable and consistent with the noble principles involved in the above lines. Now I have done with your book on "The Causes of Indian Revolt" so far as it concerned that resolution of the National Congress which prays for the introduction of a representative element in the Legislative Councils of India.

Most of these extracts, except one or two here and there, were abstract, and perhaps you may, with your usual calmness, have the boldness to say that there is nothing in these quotations which goes to prove that you ever meant to say that these representatives to the Council of India should be elected by the subjects. Very good, I will search out quotations which will leave nothing doubtful. You may not have forgotten that two months after the opening of your Scientific Society, you delivered "a vigorous speech" at the laying of the foundation stone of the New Gazhipore, now the Victoria College. In the course of that address you said : "Bear in mind, gentlemen, that Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria has had proclaimed in this country that her servants and subjects, European and native, are to be considered as being on an equal footing ; *and this assurance, gentlemen, is not a mere matter of form but a reality*." The italics are mine. Now, Sir Syed Ahmed, will you still laugh at us because we believe this —this very proclamation—to be our Magna Charta ?

Further on in the course of the same address you said : "The appointment of Natives to the Supreme Council was a memorable incident in the history of India. The day is not far distant I trust and when it does come, you will remember my words when that council will be composed of representatives from every division or district, and that thus the Laws which it will pass will be laws enacted by the feelings of the entire country."

"You will see that this cannot come to pass unless we strive to educate ourselves thoroughly. I once had a conversation with one in high authority on this very subject, and he said that Government would be only too glad if a scheme, such as I have sketched above, were practicable, but he felt doubtful ; if it were stated that there were qualified men in every District, Government would gladly avail itself of their knowledge and give them seats in Council. I knew this only too well and felt ashamed that such was the case. What I have above stated is only to inculcate in your minds the great fact that Her Most Gracious Majesty wishes all her subjects to be treated alike ; and let their religion, tribe, or colour be what

it may, the only way to avail ourselves of the many roads to fame and usefulness is to cultivate our intellects and to conform ourselves to the age." Sir Syed, have the happiness to know that the day, which you in 1864 said was not far distant is coming nearer, and that you need no longer feel so much ashamed of your countrymen for not conforming to the age. Your prophecy is not fulfilled yet, but we are certain that sometime or other it is sure to be fulfilled, and then you will have the satisfaction of feeling that you did not prophesy in vain. Sir Syed, do you wish to withdraw this prophesy of yours, and if so why ? Please explain—I and others like me are waiting in suspense. Only say that with the return of sobriety and the calmness of old age you have come to know your own errors, and we will no more trouble you with these prophecies. Sir Syed, would you please point out what else could be the meaning of the above sentence except that, that India would some (in 1864, not far distant) day be governed by Councils composed of members elected by the people themselves ? If not this, how can the laws be said to be "enacted by the feelings of the entire country."

Two months before you spoke the words quoted above on the 9th January, 1864, you started a Translation Society now known as the Scientific Society of Aligarh ; and in the course of a speech then delivered pointing out the ignorance of your countrymen you said : "From their ignorance of the events of the past, and also of the events of the present—from their not being acquainted with the manner and means by which infan nations have grown into powerful and flourishing ones, and by which the present most advanced ones have beaten their competitors in the race for position among the magnates of the world—they are unable to take lessons and profit by their experience." Sir, we took your advice, and your countrymen have learnt the means and the manner by which they can advance the growth of their "infant nation" to the position of a "powerful" and a "flourishing" one. How is it that this growth which you so much desired in 1864 is an eyesore to you now ? How is it that now at this period you cannot feel any pleasure in seeing a combination of all the different races and sects towards the accomplishment of the great end for

which you have been until recently struggling so hard. How is it that you are going to prove that you did not deserve the distinctions so deservedly, as we thought, bestowed upon you? By your present attitude, by your present utterances, you mean to prove that all that you once said, all that you once did, for which you were rightly honoured both by the Government and the people, and for which you were said to be deserving of being "awarded a conspicuous place on the list of benefactors" of India, was, after all, but utter nonsense—because that is the phrase you now apply to the repetition of those same principles which you once so strenuously advocated —by the supporters of the National Congress.

On the 10th of May, 1886, you addressed a large and influential meeting of the European and native residents of Aligarh on the necessity of Indian affairs being more prominently brought before Parliament and of forming an association for this purpose (at least so says your biographer on pp. 88 and 89). In the course of this speech you compared the British rule with that of the "former Emperors and Rajas" of India. You said "it" (*i.e.* the rule of the latter) "was based upon nothing but tyranny and oppression; the law of might was that of right; the voice of the people was not listened to; the strong and the turbulent, the oppressed, the feeble and the poor, and usurped all their privileges with impunity for their own selfish ends. It is only therefore by such usurpers and turbulent spirits that a despotism, such as flourished in Hindustan for many long centuries, is at all to be desired." Know, Sir, that the National Congress wants nothing but that voice of the people be listened to, and that the strong and turbulent" may not oppress "the feeble and the poor." The National Congress wants to achieve these ends by peaceful means and in fact by prayers; while it can only be the usurpers and the turbulent who desire to threaten, as you now do, the use of arms. It can only be the self-assumed "strong" who can threaten "the poor" with the use of the arms, by "the followers of the prophet." Further on, you regretted the indifference, with which the affairs of India were treated in the Parliament, and laid the blame of it to a great extent upon the shoulders of your own countrymen. You said: "India,

you to inaugurate a measure like this—deters you from coming forward for your country's good......Believe me that this moral cowardice is wrong—the apprehension unfounded, and that there is not an Englishman of a liberal turn of mind in India who would regard with feelings other than those of pleasure and hope, such a healthy sign of increased civilization on the part oi its inhabitants. The natives have at present little or no voice in the management of the affairs of their country, and should any measure of Government prove obnoxious to them, they brood over it, appearing outwardly satisfied and happy while discontent is rankling in their mind." Further on you said that the natives were in the habit of inveighing against such measures in their homes, but to the Europeans they represented that they were satisfied with the justice and wisdom of these very measures. You loudly proclaimed "that such a state of affairs is inimical to the welfare of the country. Far better would it be for India, were her people openly and honestly to express their opinions as to the justice or otherwise of the acts of Government" Would you pray tell me, "Sir, why we are sedition-mongers; is it because we speak "honestly" as to the justice or otherwise of the acts of the Government; is it because we have overcome the moral cowardice with which you charged us? Are we seditious because we do not want to keep "discontent rankling" within our hearts? Are we disloyal because we, according to your own teachings, have come forward to speak up for our country's good? If we deserve all these epithets on account of all these I must say, Sir, that you are the father of all this. You taught us to do exactly what we have begun doing now. You not only taught but encouraged us by your own example. Why do you now deprecate "this healthy sign of civilization", as you once called it, on the part of Indians? If we, the followers of your old principles, have exceeded the proper dimension which, I humbly maintain, we have not, it is surely not advisable to root out these instincts from within us, but rather to point out the place and the occasion where we have exceeded. How have you come to oppose the principles themselves, the principles so lovingly promulgated by you? Say that the principles are not to be discarded, but the men abusing these

principles are to be despised. We will then know how to love the principles and not the men. We loved you because you held these principles, because we thought you loved your country above everything, because we considered you to be one of the fathers as the present India, and if we have erred we must say we think that you should have pointed out our error in time. Truly has a poet said : *Khwab tha jo kuchhki dekha tha, afsana tha jo kuchh ke suna tha, i.e.*, "What I saw was but a dream, what I heard an idle tale." Ah ! human delusions are then destined to delude the human eye for ever !

Again with a pause, with a promise of more in my next.

I am yours, &c.,

22nd November, 1888 The Son of an old Follower of Yours

IV

The fourth meeting of the Indian National Congress is soon to be held at Allahabad, and so I think I must hasten to give some more of the most important quotations in this letter of mine. The less important ones I leave for some future occasion.

When this letter reaches you, you will be, possibly smiling over the ex-Viceroy's speech delivered at the St. Andrew's Dinner, Calcutta. If you will only take the trouble of reading that speech with your eyes open, you will find that your uproar against the introduction of some representative element in the Legislative Councils of India is not liked even by those whom you have undertaken to flatter, and whose national traditions you try to belie.

Sir Syed, for God's sake, reconsider your position and do not disappoint us just when the morning of hope has begun to dawn over us and our mother-land.

Now to proceed with your old writings and sayings ; please turn to pages 207 and 208 of your *Social Reformer* for 1298 Hijri, equivalent to the year 1881 A.D. There, while giving an account of your voyage to London, you said that on the way

you happened to see Mr. D. Fitzpatrick, the former Deputy Commissioner of Delhi, with whom you talked about "goodness or badness of the Punjab administration." Therein you profess to have said that the Government of the Punjab was a *despotic* one, though a thousand times better than that of the Sikhs. Further on you say "the people of the Punjab may be happy and perhaps may like it because they have been just taken out of fire and made to sit in the sun. But we cannot like it. The goodness or badness of the Punjab Government *i e.* of the Government of the non-Regulation Provinces, should be asked of the innabitants of Delhi, Panipat, Rohtak, Hissar and Sirsa districts, which once used to belong to Regulation Provinces and have now been subjected to a non-Regulation (or *beqanuni*) Punjab Administration. As far as I know people think that of many other punishments, which had been awarded to the inhabitants of Delhi and its adjacent districts in the Mutiny, this was also one that they were made over to the Government of the Punjab and thus made the subjects of non-Regulation Provinces." These lines were written at a time when the North-Western Provinces did not enjoy the blessings of having a Provincial Legislature of its own, and so the only superiority in the administration of the N.W.P. over that of the Punjab then, was the existence of a High Court instead of the Chief Court in the Punjab, and the constitution of a Board of Revenue instead of a Financial Commissionership here. The word "*Despotic*" is your own, and is used in your Urdu style, and thus you cannot say that the word has been unwittingly thrust upon you by the translator. Even at the risk of unidiomatic English I have tried to give a literal translation of your Urdu sentences. If you think that this translation is incorrect, I trust you will not, for the sake of your own reputation, fail to publish a true translation of the sentences quoted. Now, will you please explain on what principles you designated the Government of the Punjab as despotic, and how you distinguished it in that respect from the Government of India or that of N.W.P. ? I can venture to say that the Government of the Punjab was never more despotic than the Governments of other sister Provinces. No doubt the merit of each Government to a considerable degree depends upon the personal character of its

head. The Governments of Montgomery, Aitchison and even that of Sir James Lyall cannot be said to be more despotic than that of any of the Governors of other Provinces. Can you, Sir, in the face of this broad accusation of yours, still designate us as reckless accusers of Government and its policy ? Further on in the same article you go on saying : "In fact the present time is not one in which people may like a despotic Government, nor are those virtues (which in ancient times used to be mixed with a thousand vices) of a despotic Government, and by which the influence of the former were an antidote for the latter, to be found in these days. Now-a-days it is not possible for those virtues to exist in any despotic Government, and the people who think that in India a despotic Government, such as it used to be in by-gone times, would be more appropriate and useful than the constitutional form of Government, are greatly mistaken. They are just like one who judges a garden by its state in the autumn without caring to think what it will be in the spring." The word "despotic" throughout this quotation is your own, Sir.

At another place, on page 132 of the same journal for the same year, under the heading of the Eastern Arts and Sciences, you exhort us not to devote ourselves to them but to the study of Western ones. You ask us even "to forget our mother-tongue" (an impossibility in itself) because you said our national advancement only "depended upon the spread of Western Sciences." You said, "Let us by all means remain loyal to the Government, let us always regard it to be our patron and well-wisher, and let us at the same time try to extricate ourselves from that servile and savage state in which we are." Nobly and truly did you say that this, and this only, should be the subject of a generous kind-hearted Government who rules over a nation for the good of the latter, or, say, for the good of the human race. In the course of the same article on the same page of your *Tahzib-ul-Ikhlaq* you say "no nation can ever advance in parallel lines all travelling from one point to another. Nations always advance in the shape of a triangle, whose one corner projects in advance of the others. To think that we may not be divided in different sects is to pray that we

may not be enlightened by the light of Western ideas. In contrast to this, please reconsider your Meerut speech, in which in fact you wanted to express that the whole nation must remain in the background because *you think* that the Mahomedan community has not sufficiently advanced to fully reap the benefits to be enjoyed by the granting of the boons prayed for by the National Congress. (I do not admit that the Mahomedan community is not sufficiently advanced.)

On page 136 of the same Journal you say, "I sincerely believe and wish to assure the Government that the same discontented educated critics" (meaning those educated gentlemen who severely criticize the Government measures and who are blamed for it) "yield to none in their appreciation of the British rule; hence it is not just to effect the ruin of our education on account of any apprehension of such criticism." These are the words which you addressed to those politicians who advocate the closing of Government Colleges and schools, and who are of opinion that education in Western ideas and sciences has made the Indians disloyal. You would, I suppose, like to re-read those words also by which you encourage your own educated countrymen to fight out the battle of their national advancement bravely and without fear. You say, "Without doubt, there are many difficulties in the way of our doing so" (*i.e.*, promulgating those blessings of education, instruction and enlightenment which we acquire in those civilized countries to which we go on completing our education). "On one side we are to contend against the prejudices and ignorance of our own countrymen, and on the other side we are to bear the opposition of those narrow-minded men of the conquering race to whom our social and political advancement is an eyesore, and who dislike us because we have adopted English life, English politics and the manners of an English gentleman ; and change of dress even infuriates them to such a degree that they look at us with angry eyes as a pious man looks at a great criminal. But we should keep the good of our nation at heart and should bear all the difficulties and troubles which beset our way with the greatest possible forbearance and perseverance. I do not wish to conceal that Time, the Great Reformer, will let all these things be, and no

opposition or discontent will be able to keep them back. But still there is no doubt that this narrow-mindedness is kindling the feelings of discontent, and is surely calculated to cause all sympathy and love between the governors and the governed to be banished." Sir Syed, have the happiness to learn that your countrymen took you to be a true prophet, that they are going to stick to every word which you wrote—are not to be daunted or baffled by any opposition, no, not even by yours. How is it that you preached to us to persevere and yourself could not do this ? We have persevered, but the old man has fallen ; what a pitiable spectacle of human weakness !

Next I will give an extract upon the great question of native volunteeers with which one of the Resolutions of the National Congress deals. On page 332 of our Biography, says your Biographer, that in March, 1883, when Mr. A.O. Hume (the beloved General Secretary of the National Congress) advocated the cause of native volunteers in India, and stated that in the *Mutiny* he had a brigade of infantry, cavalry and artillery in the Etawah yeomanry levy—all Volunteers—he (*i.e.* Lieutenant-Colonel Graham) addressed a letter to the Editor of the *Pioneer* in which he tried to rebut many of the arguments advanced by Mr. Hume, which letter he says brought you (Sir Syed Ahmed) down upon him in a letter which you wrote to him. He gives an extract from that letter on page 334, which runs thus, "I have perused your reply to Mr. Hume's letter advocating the volunteering of the Natives of India. In not allowing the natives to become Volunteers, the Government means to say that they do not trust the Natives of India. Its consequences should be judged from the saying : 'If you want us to trust you, you should also trust us.' There yet exists a wide gulf between the Europeans and the Natives of India, and unless it be filled up *nothing can secure and improve the prosperity of the country.*" The italics are mine. This you wrote in the middle of 1883, and now in 1887 and 1888, you say Indians do not want anything. On the same page Lieutenant-Colonel Graham writes as follows : "What I would advocate would be the selection by the local authorities in all large stations in India of a certain number of picked Native Volunteers—men

of good family and well-known for their loyalty—to be placed under the command of the Officer commanding the European Volunteers. I would let them select their own company officers, and once started I would also permit them to select their own recruits as vacancies occurred."

I say "give us this much and we will be satisfied for a long time to come."

A few important extracts more and I will have done with your old writings and sayings for the present. Contrast the meanings attached to the words "Nation" and "National" by you in your Meerut speech with those promulgated by yourself at Gurdaspur on the 27th of January, 1884. At Gurdaspur you said that "we (*i.e.*, the Hindus and Mahomedans) should try to become one heart and soul and act in unison ; if united we can support each other. If not, the effect of one against the other would tend to the destruction and downfall of both. In old historical books and traditions you will have read and heard, and we see it even now, that all the people inhabiting one country are designated by the term one *nation*. The different tribes of Afghanistan are termed as one nation, and so are the miscellaneous hordes peopling Iran, distinguished by the term. Europeans, though abounding in variety of thoughts and religions, are still known as members of one nation, though people of other countries also do come and settle with them, but being mixed together they are called members of one and the same nation. So that from the oldest times the word Nation is applied to the inhabitants of one country, though they differ in some peculiarities which are characteristic of their own. Hindu and Mahomedan brethren, do you people any country other than Hindustan ? do you not inhabit the same land ? are you not burned and buried on the same soil ? do you not tread the same ground and live upon the same soil ? Remember that the words Hindu and Mahomedan are only meant for religious distinction—otherwise all persons, whether Hindu or Mahomedan, even the Christians who reside in this country are all in this particular respect belonging to one and the same nation. Then all these different sects can only be described as one nation ; they must each

and all unite for the good of the country which is common to all."

Again in your Lahore speech, which was delivered in reply to the address of the Indian Association of Lahore, you, on the 3rd of February, 1884, said as follows : "Even granting that the majority of those composing this Association are Hindus, still I say that this light has been diffused by the same whom I call by the epithet of Bengalees. I assure you that Bengalees are the only people in our country whom we can properly be proud of and it is only due to them that knowledge, liberty and patriotism have progressed in our country. I can truly say that really they are the head and crown of all the different communities of Hindustan. I myself was fully cognizant of all those difficulties which obstructed my way, but notwithstanding these I heartily wished to serve my country and my nation faithfully. In the word Nation I include both Hindus and Mahomedans because that is the only meaning which I can attach to it (*i.e.* Nation or *quam*)." Here in the end, the word nation is originally used by yourself. (See the account of your trip to the Punjab by Maulvi Iqbal Ali, p. 167, line 18th). To assume : "With me it is not so much worth considering what is their religious faith, because we do not see anything of it. What we do see is that we inhabit the same land, are subject to the rule of the same Governors, the functions of benefits for all are the same, and the pangs of famine also we suffer equally. These are the different grounds upon which I call both those races which inhabit India by one word, *i.e.* Hindu, meaning to say that they are the inhabitants of Hindustan. While in the Legislative Council, I was always anxious for the prosperity of this nation." This letter of mine has already exceeded its proper dimensions, and therefore I think I must not give more extracts, and must leave the rest to be commented upon by abler hands than mine.

Anybody reading these extracts will be once for all convinced of the former loftness and present *lowness* of your *position.* Foreigners reading these extracts will not believe that your now famous Meerut and Lucknow speeches were in reality delivered by the same Sir Syed Ahmed Khan who was once

proud (whether rightly or wrongly, God knows) of his broad-mindedness. This much seems certain : either you were not the author of those ideas reproduced in the above quotations, or your recent utterances were inspired by some mind other than your own.* Poor Sir Syed, you must feel sorry for all this inconsistency, though you may not have the boldness to say so. Sir, I assure you that you should not despair ; a small sacrifice at the altar of your country, a renewed profession of the faith that was once in you will suffice to regain for you the confidence of your countrymen. If you are not prepared to do so, I must think myself justified in impeaching you in the name of consistency, in the name of honesty and fair play, in the name of the great Mahomed whose descendant and follower you profess to be, in the name of Mahdi Ali, your old devoted friend who once felt proud of showing to the world that the original Mahomedan rule was based upon democratic principles (see your *Social Reformer* for 1290 Hijri, p. 136, lines 8 to 23) ; and lastly in the name of the pupils of your own Mahomedan Anglo-Oriental College, Aligarh, whom you trained in the principles which you now affect to detest. It is a year since you actually engaged yourself in creating and keeping up an opposition to the National Congress but up to this time your countrymen have not been clearly enlightened as to what it is that you object to in the proceedings of the National Congress. You say we are not fit for a republic and so do we say. You say we are not yet fit for a Parliament and so do we say.

If you say that the introduction of some representative element even into the Government would be injurious to our community, we ask why and how, and pray when did you receive that revelation because up to 1884 you yourself acknowledged the necessity of these Legislative Councils being reconstituted upon some representative basis. Then, again, when were you inspired with the idea that the Hindu and the

*Can it be that your once massive, manly intellect has succumbed to the feeble, schoolgirl-like sophistries of your shallow-pated employer ? That Merlin-like, the great heart that once beat true for India is now pulseless, and that you lie bound, inextricably, by the treacherous spells of a modern Vivient, even more despicable than his female prototype ?

Mahomedan interests are sure to cash at least in this respect? Because up to 1884 you believed in the doctrine of Hindus and Mahomedans having one and the same political interests and being members of one and the same nation. To your friends Maulvies Mahdi Ali and Mahdi Hussain, whose tergiversation is not less amazing than your own. I have only a few words to say. To the former that he had better now suppress his lecture published in the *Social Reformer* for 1290 Hijri on pp. 136 and those preceding and following it. To the latter that he should now publicly recant the views set forth in his article under the heading of "Liberty" published in your *Social Reformer* for 1298 Hijri, 1881, from pp. 231 to 341. Until they do this I will ask them to abstain, if they desire any human being to credit them with common honesty, from abusing us and denouncing our principles, and to my other countrymen as well as to our rulers I have only to say further,

"I know a maiden fair to see,
Take care,
She can both false and friendly be,
Beware! Beware!
Trust her not,
She is fooling thee.
She has two eyes so soft and brown,
Take care.
She gives a side-glance and looks down,
Beware! Beware!
Trust her not,
She is fooling thee.
And she has hair of a golden hue,
Take care!
And what she says is not true,
Beware! Beware!
Trust her not,
She is fooling thee.
She has a bosom as white as snow,
Take care!
She knows how much it is best to show.
Beware! Beware!

Trust her not,
She is fooling thee."

With a promise to begin afresh in the year 1889,

I beg to subscribe myself, Sir,

Yours, &c., &c ,

20th December, 1888 The Son of an Old Follower of Yours

THE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL PROGRESS

Having been a constant reader of Indian journals, and an active sympathiser with the so called Indian political party for the last twenty years, since the beginning of my University career, I have come to the conclusion that the Indian political party has accepted the expression "politics" to be synonymous with "agitation". Agitation, constant, unending agitation for political rights, may be one of the means to be adopted by a nation to obtain them; but agitation alone cannot express what is summed up in the word "politics". Agitation only deals with the present and is based on current events. The weight that is to be attached to it must be derived from the facts and figures supplied by the present or by its immediate past. But politics concerns itself with the building up of the nation with a view to its future. It calls to its aid the past and the present, imagines and designs the future, and then proceeds to find materials for the construction of the latter. As such, it is a religion, and a science, much higher, both in its conception and in its sphere, than mere political agitation. The true politician, as I understand the word, has a creed or faith; the agitator has none. The latter has "instincts, passions, often genuine in their origin, but easily deviated, or corrupted by disappointments or the seductions of power, as soon as years have cooled his enthusiasm and his youthful blood." The politician is one "to whom observation has shown the existence of a grave social grievance or immorality, to whom intelligence has shown a remedy, and to whom the voice of conscience, enlightened by a religious conception of the human mission here below, has revealed the inexorable duty of devoting himself to the application of the remedy and extirpation of the evil. The agitator, or the reactionist, as the writer whom I am

quoting calls him, is "one urged by a sentiment of rebellion against injustice innate inminds, (sic) gifted with any power and very often by the pain and irritation consequent on being unable to assume his true place in the social order, to seek to better his own condition with the help of all who suffer under similar distress." The true politician "will pursue his forward march, whatever his individual position be, so long as the evil endures The agitator will probably stop short as soon as the overthrow of the power attacked shall have satisfied his self-love and mitigated the sense of rebellion within him." The aim of the one is always to found, that of the other is to destroy. The first is a man of progress, the second of opposition. "With the first it is a question of principle, while the second glories in details. The first has a constructive programme, while the second resorts to that analysis which only decomposes and dissolves. The true politician may fail to achieve his aim ; but if he succeeds once, his success is permanent, while the victories of a mere agitator, though sometimes brilliant, are not sure to be durable. The former invokes duty first and then rights, the latter invokes rights first and then duty. The acts of the former are influenced by a strong religious leaning, even when, through an intellectual contradiction, he professes the reverse, while the latter is irreligious and materialist, even when he proffers the name of God ; with him, *i.e.*, the latter, the present always tops the future, and material interest takes precedence of moral progress. The men of the first class, accustomed to willing sacrifice, labour less for the generation that lives around them than for the generations to come ; the triumph of the ideas they cast upon the world is slow, but infallible and decisive ; the men of the second class often win victories for their contemporaries, but their children enjoy none of the fruits. The first are the prophets of humanity, the second are the mere agitators of mankind." An agitation can always be met with a counter-agitation, and thereby rendered powerless, but principles are irresistible, and none can demolish them, if true. The future of India requires the services of politicians, and not those of mere agitators. The future of the nation requires solidity of principles and purity of methods as its basis, and not mere diplomatic make-shifts or doubtful tactics. India

wants men who, whether in good fortune or in bad fortune, not minding temporary reverses or difficulties, will lead her right through the goal, who will neither feel buoyant through the flush of preliminary success, nor feel daunted by temporary failures. Such are the men that are wanted to found and lead the Indian political party; not men of power, not men of riches, not men of titles, but men of conscience, men of energy, men of will, men who do not know how to give way to temptation of allurements, or how to be cowed down by threats and dangers; and last, but not least, men who do not know how to acknowledge a defeat. Let them chalk out a faith, a programme and their countrymen, many of whom are ardent in their love for their country, will kiss their feet and follow them right through, in good luck or in bad luck. The first thing that a politician has thus to do is to consult the future of his nation, so far as his vision can reach, and then to devise the means by which future, as imagined by him, can be reached. The second thing which a politician has to do, is to choose his creed and promulgate it. Let him first determine whether he is an absolute monarchist, a democrat or one for constitutional monarchy; because it is only then that he can, if at all, think of the proper methods which are to lead the nation to the desired end and because, in any case, the nation has to fit itself for its destiny. As the aim is, so must the means be. The political vision of the Indians, just now, only sees constitutional monarchy within its horizon, and from the very nature of things they cannot, for a long time to come, extend their horizon further. Before them is the spectacle of a nation ruled by a constitutional monarchy, happy, prosperous and politically great This nation rules over them, and although itself subject to constitutional monarchy, it rules India in the spirit of an absolute despotic monarchy. The only difference is that here in India this despotism does not rest in one individual, but in a class. The first duty of an Indian politician, therefore, even if he is a democrat, is to prepare the nation to be fit to ask for a constitution, and to do so with reason. The first necessary step is not to go in for this demand, or to settle the form of the demand, but to create those forces the operation of which will justify the nation in advancing its claims. In my humble opinion, the first axiom which every Indian poli-

tician ought to take to heart, is that no nation is worthy of any political status if it cannot distinguish between begging such rights and claiming them. A beggar can be turned out of doors without redress, but one who has to be respected as a creditor cannot. No debtor can honestly and effectively ignore a creditor, but every charitably inclined man can ignore a beggar whom he does not like, on whom he does not consider deserving. No one can deny that, just now, ours is a position of beggars. We live on the charity of our rulers. They not only rule over us, but it is thev who think for us, who manufacture for us, who preach to us, and who provide for us.

In a self-governed country, or in a healthy body politic, the Government and its subjects are one and interchangeable. They have their respective and correlative duties and rights. In a country governed by foreigners, the rulers and the subjects are not one. But the aim of all true politicians ought to be to bring about this unity. The great gulf between the subjects and their rulers can only be bridged by bringing the former up to the level of the latter in intelligence, in culture, in moral calibre, in capacity for self-sacrifice and in subordination to high ideals. The nearer the mass of subjects approach their rulers in these qualities, the easier the solution of the political problem. The nearer you reach them, the smaller the number of those duties which really belong to the subjects : but which, in the present state of society, have to be performed by the State. In a perfect commonwealth the real sovereignty rests with the people. The State exists for them and rules in their name, and thus has a smaller and more limited volume of rights than those vested in the so called subjects. Hence, real political progress consists in befitting the nation to take up those duties which, though at present performed by the ruling class, ought in a state of political health, to be discharged by the people themselves. The position thus analysed resolves itself into an educational problem. View it from whatever point you choose, religious, moral, intellectual, social, or industrial, the question of India's progress is a question of education. This is, so to say, the question of questions upon the right solution of which hang the destinies of the nation,

viz., how to educate the people so as to befit them for the performance of those duties, a proper discharge of which alone can secure for them their position in the commonwealth.

But let my countrymen remember that this momentous question of the day is not one which can be solved by speeches and resolutions only. We must be prepared to undergo great sacrifices, if we are really earnest about the future of the country, and should put our united shoulders to the wheel, to drag the car of progress to its destination, cost what it may.

The car is a heavy one, and those who care to join in carrying it must be men of strong convictions, indomitable will, irresistible energy and untiring perseverance; they must be men of action and men of honour. Let us resolve to spare all we can by living simple lives, for furthering the cause of true education in this country, as it is only useful, solid and all-covering education upon which the nation can build a character and establish a claim to be the arbiter of its own fortunes. No amount of sacrifice ought to be too great to attain this end, and the sooner we realise this, the better for ourselves as well as for the nation at large.

THE RELIGIOUS UNITY OF HINDUISM

It is often said that Hinduism is not the name of a particular religion, nor that of a religious nationality, and that it does not represent one set of beliefs, common to all who call themselves Hindus, and that therefore it is perfectly idle to appeal to the Hindus in the name of a common nationality. It has become almost a fashion to insist that the term Hinduism is too vague to be properly defined, and that there is hardly anything substantially common which binds one Hindu to another in the ties of national brotherhood. Hinduism, in short, is said to be more of congeries of different religious sects holding diverse and not unoften diametrically opposite views on matters of faith and doctrine. Hinduism is said to include and cover almost every form of religious faith known to or practised by mankind, from the purest monotheism, to the lowest form of animism, polytheism, henotheism, pantheism, in fact all sorts of *isms*.

There is a fairly large class of Hindus who suffer from want of faith in the potentialities of their religion to unite them or to inspire them to the lofty ideals of a great religious platform whereupon to bring together a Hindu union. To many the idea of a Hindu union seems to be nothing more than an unrealizable dream. In their opinion, the talk of a Hindu nationality is a senseless talk, and the attempt to bring about a union amongst Hindus on the basis of religion is extremely impracticable. Some even go further and opine that the religious difficulties of the Hindus cannot be met with, removed or solved by an appeal to Shastras, and that amongst Hindus religious reform, too, must proceed on lines and ideas borrowed from the West. We confess we are unable to subscribe to these views, and are rather inclined to hold just the otherwise. We have substantial reasons to maintain that Hinduism is at least as much a religious nationality as its sister faiths, Christianity or Islam. These who latter contain as many varieties and shades of religious beliefs and doctrines in themselves, if not more, as Hinduism does, of course giving due consideration to the ages of these three religions. If Hindus have got their Vedantists, the Muhammadans have their Sufis and the Christians have those who have raised the banner of higher Christianity. If Hindus have their Trinity in Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva, the Christians have theirs in Father, Son and Holy Ghost. If the Hindus have got their *Avatars*, the Christians have (besides the great incarnation of God in the body of Christ) their Popes and saints. If the Hindus believe in different deities, there are Muhammadans and Christians who believe in saints, *Walis*, *Mahdis*, &c., &c , If the Hindus have their sacrifices, the Muhammadans and Christians have theirs also. If there are Hindus who are steeped in superstitious beliefs and observe many gross frmms of worship, there are millions and millions of Muhammadans and Christians also, particularly the latter, whose religious practices are as gross as those of the multitude of Hindus. If there are fables in the Puranas, there are equally ridiculous stories in the Quran and the Bible What is, then, that deprives Hinduism of that binding force which knits together the different discordant elements in Islam and Christianity ? What are the special features of the latter that are absent in the former ? Is Hinduism entirely devoid of any

basal principles on which the foundations of a church national could be laid ? It is these latter that we, at first, propose to take in hand and examine touching upon the former whenever it is relevant to do so. Our first contention is, that, like the general mass of Muhammadans and Christians, the Hindus, likewise, directly or indirectly profess to accept the Vedas as their religious scripture. The great bulk of the latter like the great bulk of the former, believe that their scriptures are the words of God, and are infallible. There are learned Muhammadans and Christians who cannot go so far and do not believe that the Quran and the Bible are the words of God. On the question of the exact authority of the scriptures in these great religious of the world there are as many schools and shades of thought with all their varieties and niceties in one as in the other. There are scoffers, agnostics and sceptics everywhere. Everywhere there are men who do not care a jot for the scripture, make no secret of their views, but still cling to the outer form of the religion, the very essence of which they take pleasure in decrying. The number of such Christians is legion who do not believe that Christ was the son of God or the son of the Virgin, or that the Bible is the revealed word of God, but who do not still care to go out of the pale of outward Christianity. For the purposes of baptism, marriage, etc., they are as much Christians as those who believe that every letter of the Bible was spoken by God Himself.

We have said all this not with the intention of disparaging either Islam or Christianity but only in support of our contention that in these respects the religious difficulties of the Hindus are in no way greater in extent, or larger in volume, than those of their fellow subjects, the Muhammadans and the Christians. We know there are some people who are so hopeless of Hindu unity, or who are so much perplexed with the endless variety of religious belief in Hinduism, that in moments of despondency they have been heard to apostrophize if it would not be better for India if all Hindus were to accept Christianity, but irrespective of spiritual efficiency or inefficiency of Christianity, we are afraid even from the unity point of view we will not not thereby be nearer the desired millennium. That such is the opinion of all impartial and disinterested observer s

will be amply borne out by the following quotations which we cull from a paper written by the late Professor Theodore Goldstucker on the "Religious Difficulties of India." In the paper under reference were noticed certain (then) recent publications* by two learned Hindu converts to Christianity criticising Hindu religion and philosophy and exhorting their late co-religionists to solve their religious problem by embracing Christianity.

After giving copious extracts from these publications containing the views of these learned Padries on the inconsistencies and anomalies of Hindu religion and Hindu philosophy, with his own comments thereupon, the learned Professor says: "There another serious perplexity into which our learned authors must be aware that they will throw even those Hindus who may be clever enougn to overcome all these difficulties, but it has as little been removed by them as indeed any difficulty which besets the solution of the religious problem in India. Their object, as we have seen, is to persuade their countrymen to embrace the Christian religion, but they have neither explained to them what the Christian religion is, nor where it may be found. Any Hindu, who follows the deductions of Mr. Banerjee, would simply infer that there is but one Christian religion, which a devout student of the Bible might easily acquire from a perusal of the sacred book. Let him descend, however, from the region of abstraction into that of reality, and he will soon discover the endless variety of opinions which may be founded on the apparently so intelligible scriptural text, and he will soon learn that, so far from this being a mere possibility, hundreds of creeds have sprung from this same scriptural soil, every one of which claims to be in exclusive possession of Christianity. And if he be disposed to investigate historically the mutual relation of all these creeds he will find that their difference is so essential that it was strong enough to perpetuate the most inveterate animosities and

**Dialogues on Hindu Philosophy comprising the Niyaya, Samkhya and the Vedanta to which is added a discussion on the authority of the Vedas by* K M. Banerjee of Bishop College, Calcutta, and *A Rational Refutation of Hindu Philosophical Systems* by Nilkanth Shastri Gore.

to result in wars the like of which cannot be traced in the history of any other creed.

We have no desire to enlarge upon this theme, for we have said enough to explain why we hold the solution proposed by Mr. Banerjee to be an impossibility. Attempts of conversion are too frequently made without examining the limits within which they are possible and the result in which their momentary success may end. If a man derives his religious views from his own individual information or from sources which are void of authoritative influence, he may yield them to the views which are of a higher range without causing injury to the nobler part of himself. But if the creed of an individual is founded on texts held sacred and authoritative, it is a national creed ; no individual can abandon it without severing himself from the national stem ; no nation can surrender it without laying the axe to its own root. For religion based on texts believed sacred, embodies the whole history of the nation which professes it ; it is the shortest abbreviation of all that ennobles nation's mind, is most dear to its memory and most essential to its life. No religion has better illustrated this truth than the religion founded on the Bible. It could, and was successfully, introduced amongst all nations which possess no texts supposed to be divinely inspired, and therefore of general authority, and whenever a nation possessing merely the semblance of such a text, adopted it, it thereby decreed its own end. The Romans and Greeks, when becoming Christians, ceased to be the continuation of the classical Romans and Greeks, in history, in literature, in character. Their political importance based on the conditions of the past, was brought to a close, and they had to grow into another nationality. The conditions under which this religion introduced itself into the countries of Europe was always the absence of a book ascribed to divine authorship. When Mr. Banerjee speaks of the Jews, he has chosen an exact counter instance which goes far to prove that even a people without land, without any history which can be called their own, that a people exposed to all the horrors of persecution and all the allurements of seduction did not and does not espouse that very religion which exercises the most powerful influence on its actual destinies and which it even supports and

favours amongst those who profess it. The Jews do not become Christians, simply because they believe that their Testament is a sacred book."

Having expressed these views as to the undesirability and impossibility of converting Hindus to Christianity, Professor Goldstucker further addresses the Hindus themselves, and lays down what, in his opinion, is the true key to the solution of their religious difficulty. We cannot do better than once more quote his words which are full of significance and pregnant with great meaning to all educated Hindus :

"We have been carried, however, with these remarks to the point where we cannot shrink from expressing the views which we entertain of the duties of the Brahmanical Hindus of our own days. We need not emphasise more than we have already done, that we reject as unwise and unpractical any attempt to persuade them to become Christians or to adopt the Biblical scriptures as their spiritual code. We want them to become a nation worthy of their ancestors and worthy of the great role, which in ancient times they have acted in the history of the human race, and we are satisfied that they cannot regain that position by breaking the spring ties of their life and by exchanging their own religious uncertainty for that of any other creed. It is necessary, however, that they should realise the condition in which they are. We need not prove to them that the minds of the enllightened portion of their nation are estranged from the sectarian worship as it is practised now, but who could satisfy them they are utterly remiss in examining where the root of the evil lies. Every Brahmanical believer, if asked, will tell that the mode of his worship is founded on the Vedas. He refers us, it is true, occasionally to the Puranas and Tantras, but he himself admits that these works have no authoritative powers unless they can prove that the tenets they contain are drawn from the Vedic source. The pivot, then, on which all religious questions of India turn, is and remains—the Vedas. Philosophers and non-Philosophers, Vishnuits and Sivaits, all echo the word Veda ;......"

Forty years have elapsed since these words were written by one of the profoundest Sanskrit scholars and one of the most

component and shrewd students of comparative religions, which Europe produced, but the words hold as good, as true and as forcible today as they were ever. In fact, the events of these forty years have, instead of showing any flaw either in the arguments or in the sentiments of the learned Professor, proved, if any further proof was needed, how accurately did he grasp the real situation and how truly did he lay down the solution.

We repeat, therefore, before we close for the present that the pivot on which all religious questions of Hindu India turn is, and remains—the Vedas. To the Vedas, therefore, we must go for light and guidance in our religious trobles, and in the Vedas we shall find our solace.

A STUDY OF HINDU NATIONALISM

I have read with considerable interest the article by a "Hindu Nationalist," on the Creation of a Hindu Nationality, in the June number of the *Samachar*, as also the contribution on the same subject, in the last number of this Journal, by my friend Pandit Madho Ram. White I heartily join in the "Hindu Nationalist's" appeal to the educated Hindus, yet I do not share his opinion that "the idea of Nationality is an essentially European and modern idea," nor can I agree with his reading of the facts of history relied upon by him in support of his assertion. In my humble opinion the ideas of "nationality" and "patriotism" are as old as the different countries into which the earth is divided, as ancient as the distinctions of race and religion that have been existing in this world from times immemorial and pre-historic. They may have been more phenomenal in one epoch than in another. Their hold on different races and nations may have varied in intensity or extent, but that the ideas have always been there, as fixed and immutable as those of truth and falsehood, is my firm belief. It is not, however, my intention to enter into a speculative or an historical controversy with the "Hindu Nationalist" on the origin of the sentiments of nationality and patriotism. Suffice it to say that I agree with most of his conclusions and am prepared to generally endorse the remedies

suggested. In fact, some of the thoughts expressed in his article were, as if, foreshadowed by me in my article on the Congress published in the *Samachar* for October 1901. This reference has been made not to suggest any borrowing on the part of the "Hindu Nationalist," but to show that these thoughts are just now uppermost in the minds of all such Hindus as claim to love their people and to think of the means of their progress.

The "Nationalist" begins by bemoaning the absence of the idea of nationality amongst Hindus, and ascribes all our misfortunes past and present to the same fact. "The Hindus," he says, "offer a curious instance of a people without any feeling of nationality." Having thus laid down the proposition he appeals to the pages of history to support his conclusion and apparently seems to have made out a strong case. But he has evidently missed the fact that his own proposition assumes the existence of a people having a common name, who have made history by that time. Quite unconsciously he assumes the existence of a Hindu nationality when he talks of the unsuccessful efforts of the Rajputs and the Mahrattas to throw off the foreign yoke and to found a Hindu empire. What he complains of is that these efforts were spasmodic, not supported by the general body of the people and therefore not quite national, but all the time he admits by implication that there was a nation which could and should have made a combined effort. Otherwise what can he possibly mean by saying that "the Mahrattas were left to fight the last battle of the Hindus alone, unaided by the Sesodia or the Rathore?" He admits that "if allowed to grow unchecked the Mahratta confederacy might have developed into a national empire" In the face of these facts we cannot deny the existence of a nation simply because all the members of that nation did not join in the struggle for defence, or that some of them seceded or proved traitors, or joined the enemy's camp. Nor can we deny the existence of the sentiment of nationality, because that sentiment was not sufficiently strong and marked to overcome all differences among the different members of that nation, to enable them to stand as one man in defence of national interests. In the next place, why ignore

the united front presented by the Hindus of all classes to repel the fourth invasion of Mahmud of Ghazni, and why forget the empires of the Pandavas, of Asoka, of Siladittya, Vikram, Bhoja, and others ? Even the ill-fated Prithvi Raj, the last of the Hindu Emperors, who paid the penalty of the empire in the battle of Thaneswar, twice could command the united services of almost the whole nation in his noble and valiant defence of the empire and the fatherland. Who knows that but for the treachery of that fratricide of a Jai Chand, history would have been made otherwise ? But the treachery of Jai Chand and the defeat of Prithvi Raj do not detract from the character of the heroic stand which the nation made against the foreigner. Victories and defeats are not solely made by man but are regulated by many a cause some of which may be quite outside the control of the parties at war. If in 1193 providence decreed the fall of the Hindus, that alone is not sufficient to justify us in damning the Hindus of that period as men who were totally bereft of the sentiment of nationality. Then, as I have already hinted, the very fact of our people being known to other peoples by a distinctive name, is a proof of the existence of Hindu nationality.

I am too old now to continue to believe that the name Hindu was for the first time given to us as one involving abuse, contempt and reproach by our Mohammedan invaders. Rather, I believe that our fall and degradation helped the fall of the word also, and perhaps a peep into the philological history of the word might prove that all the bad meanings that are now assigned to the word in the Persian lexicon were of a comparatively later origin, and an outcome of the fall of the Hindu nation. Long before the Mohammedan invasion, and perhaps long before the advent of the Prophet of Islam, we were known to the people of other countries as Hindus. If so, what did this name signify ? Was it a tribal distinction ? I say, no, because the Hindus were of many tribes. Was it a racial name ? I again say, no, because the Persians of Iran too, belonged to the same race. Was it then a religious designation ? Yes, partly religious no doubt, but mainly national, and in evidence I can produce a number of quota-

tions from the productions of early Greek historians and Mohammedan writers. For example, in what other sense does the Homer of Persia, the gifted Firdousi, who has immortalised the struggle for supremacy between the Iranians and the Turanians, use the expression Hindu in the following verses, which I pick at random from his great work, the *Shahnama*.*

Then we find many references to our people as Hindus in the sacred books of the Parsis, the *Vendidad* and others. So far as the name is concerned, our only difficulty arises when we fail to find any trace of it in our own literature where our people are invariably styled as Aryas. But here again we find enough traces of the sentiment of nationality in the passages in which the Rishis ordained all Aryas to combine against the attacks of *Dasyus*, *Chandalas* and *Mlechhas*. Gods are often invoked for protection against the latter. As for indications of an imperial spirit amongst the Hindus, the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata* are full of evidences of the same. What was King Yudhisthra's *Rajsuya Yajna* and by what name would you style the ambitious scheme of Jarasindhu ?

The fact is that the best and the most glorious period of Aryan supremacy is yet a closed chapter to us. Almost the whole of the pre-Buddhistic period is shrouded in mystery. Even the literature that has reached us is so full of allusions, enigmas, signs, and names and is written in such an archaic language that the whole thing seems to be a mystery. According to the best of European authorities, the language of the Vedas is so full of obsolete and archaic forms and expressions that the whole seems to be a cipher which with the best of efforts might yet take years to decipher. Still we know and understand enough to be proud of, and to glory in the heritage which has descended to us from our "barbarian" (?) ancestors in the shape of national literature. And this must be the fulcrum of the lever with which we are to rise as a nation. It will not do to be unjust to our forefathers and to deny the idea of national love in them. No, they were patriots according to the best of their own light. The history of our country,

*The verses are in Persian and have not been reproduced here.

from the standpoint of a Hindu, has yet to be written and till that is done, let us suspend judgement, remembering that the men whom we desire to judge and whom we are sometimes inclined to hastily condemn (often unheard) were master minds, whose productions and teachings are the loftiest in the whole range of written or known thoughts. We the English educated Hindus of the present day, who claim to have imbibed the new spirit of nationality and patriotism from the West would really do well to study a few chapters of the Vedic literature with care and thought, and I am confident that this study will open a panorama of new ideas to our view. Such a study will, I am sure, enable us to see that the key-note of the pre-Buddhistic Vedic religion was the sacrifice of all for all. True, that the genius of a jealous and perverted, sometimes corrupt and selfish, priesthood built such a vast and stupendous super-structure of conventionalities and formalities, with an almost interminable labyrinth of rituals and ceremonials obscured by the true spirit which of the religion was practically lost and could no longer be the stay of the nation.

It is this submergence of the true spirit of the ancient Hindu faith under the load of conventional rituals and formal ceremonials, that has since been the bane of the Hindus and not the entire absence of the idea of nationality. But you might say, that we have been producing martyrs and no one can be a martyr except by the strength of faith. How can a nation destitute of faith produce martyrs ? Is there a nation who have shown more of faith in their religion, in their individuality, in their sacred law than the Hindus ? How can you otherwise explain their tenacity in clinging to their forms of religion, their pertinacity to stick to their customs ? I purposely say forms of religion because real religion, the religion that guides and moulds a man, or a nation, and that elevates and ennobles them, that raises them to high ideals, that evokes the highest of sacrifices, has long ago disappeared from us. In fact, it was never in the post-Buddhistic period restored to its altar in the temple of hearts. True, martyrs we have certainly been producing, ever and anon, and sometimes in numbers, but when I accuse the Hindus of want of faith, I do not mean individual faith, but that social faith which is the parent of

victory ; the faith that arouses the multitudes ; faith in their own destiny, in their own mission and in the mission of the epoch ; the faith that leads on to struggle ; the faith that enlightens and bids men advance fearlessly in the ways of God and Humanity, with their religion in their heart and their future progress as their goal. It is such a faith that we have been wanting since the time of Buddha and it is such a faith that we require to become a nation again.

I shall now discuss the observations of Mr. Madho Ram and I shall remark at the outset that even admitting for argument's sake the absolute accuracy of all his statements and facts, and also the correctness of the inferences he draws therefrom I would beg to differ from him in a matter of principle My esteemed friend seems to think that all these internecine quarrels, strifes and sectarian struggles which he records at such great length in the course of his article largely take away "the chance for the progress of Hindu Nationalism in our country," or to be more accurate in quoting his words he questions the Hindu Nationalist, if in the face of circurmstances stated by him "there is much chance for the progress of Hindu Nationalism in our country." I answer the question in the affirmative. What I am anxious to point out is, that the existence of these quarrels and strifes is neither a bar to the progress of Hindu Nationalism, nor is it a sufficient proof of the absence of the idea ot Nationality amongst the Hindus. And this, for the simple reason that the idea of nationality does not necessarily imply a complete union amongst all its members on all matters. social, religious or political ; nor does it suggest the existence of a state of perfect concord and harmony among its members or leaders, or the freedom of the latter from all human weaknesses such as to personalities or indulgences in strong or even abusive language amongst, and towards each other. Has there been any nation in the past, or is there any nation now living, which has been or is free from these differences or quarrels ? Surely, Roman, Grecian, and Mohammedan histories must be admitted to present splendid and noble types of nationality and nationalism, and the present times cannot furnish better and nobler types of nationality than the English, the German, and the American

and the French, not to speak of others equally noble though not so influential and powerful, such as the Swiss, the Italian, and the Dutch. Religious and social differences have played a prominent part in the histories of these nations and even now they are not free from the same. A mere glance at the English and Irish papers, a perusal of the speeches in Parliament and out of Parliament by political men, a study of the literature of different religious sects in the West and a perusal of the biographies of the public men in these countries, will show that the incidents narrated by my friend, altogether lose in significance and weight in the presence of the more vituperative and sometimes highly abusive differences and quarrels of these magnates of the European world. The truth is that honest differences, controversial discussions, and criticisms of public men by public men, are absolutely necessary for the healthy growth and progress of nationality. Then, we must be prepared to meet with human weaknesses, partialities, jealousies, personalties' insinuations, innuendos, use of strong language etc., in these discussions, and controversies. Carried beyond a certain degree and limit, they might retard the growth of nationalism, or might bring down an already completed edifice of nationality. I am not, however, prepared to admit that the differences and the disputes amongst the different classes of educated Hindus at the present moment exceed that limit. It is wrong to suppose that the idea of nationalism or nationality requires a complete union in all details of religious, social, economical, or political life or that it requires a complete freedom from sectarian quarrels or disputes or jealousies. To expect so, is to expect what is an impossibility and what entirely ignores human nature. In my humble opinion it is sufficient for the growth of nationality if the different parts that claim the shelter of its way have a sense of unity, which is sufficient to make them combine against a common enemy and a common danger. Run on a few basal principles in religion, on the community of a sacred language, and on the community of interests, the Hindus ought to foster the growth of a national sentiment which should be sufficiently strong to enable them to work for the common good in the different ways and according to the lights vouchsafed to each. Let us keep

one ideal before us. Let our ideal be sufficiently high to cover all, sufficiently broad and extensive to include all, who take pride in one common name, a common ancestry, a common history, a common religion, a common language, and a common future.

We will not advance the cause of nationality by one inch if we decide to preserve an attitude of silent quietude and non-disturbing peace in all matters, religious and social. Such an attitude can only mean stagnation and gradual extinction. Struggle, hard struggle, is the law of progress. Yes struggle we must, both *inter se* as well others. There must be struggle between truth and untruth, between vice and virtue, between honesty and dishonesty, between expediency and righteousness, between indolence and energy, between enterprise and a spirit of lethargy, and between time-seeing selfishness and noble disinterestedness. Without this struggle no nation can ever aspire to be great and influential. This struggle we have just entered upon. We have just emerged out of stagnation, and it is no wonder that we are sometimes apt to exceed the limits of propriety or to irresistibly throw in more of sectarianism and personality, where more or much less is needed. But national delinquencies or faults are not made up or remedied in a day. Let us not be impatient of what in my humble opinion seems to be a healthy sign of growth. Let us not strangle it by drawing its undesirable concomitants in high colours or by attaching undue importance to the same. Then there are men and men in all public bodies, religious and social. Because there are some violent men, some bad tempered, some dishonest men, some traitors and time-servers in our public associations, it is no reason to record a wholesale condemnation of the same or to be disappointed with them. Public opinion in this country has yet to grow. It is a very feeble plant yet. Its growth must cause some unpleasant friction and struggle. Let us not be impatient of it. The country has yet to foster a bold spirit of disinterested, fearless criticism. Few people in this country are guided by purely public interests. Fewer still are those who can be moved to take interest in things which do not concern them exclusively and in which they have little at stake. The interests of others do not move them. What little

criticism exists in the country, is at once dubbed as sectarian, as interested, or as the outcome of jealousy or personal animosity. This criticism, that potent weapon, which alone can effectually check the vicious or selfish tendencies of great and powerful men, is discouraged and strangled What we should aim at is not the silencing of criticism but the purging it out of personalities, jealousies, abuse and vituperation. This will take time, but so long as this is not achieved, let us not discourage, run down and do away with criticism altogether. At any rate, in my humble opinion impatience at, or silencing of mutual criticism, or absence of all controversy will not necessarily mean unity, or a healthy progress of nationalism. Having thus disposed to the best of my power the objections of the "Hindu Nationalist" based—to my mind—on a wrong view of our ancient history, and that of Pandit Madho Ram who has, in my opinion, drawn erroneous inferences from the facts detailed by him and the accuracy of which I have assumed for the sake of argument, I conclude this article with a hope that I may be able to return to the subject in a later issue and discuss the present condition and prospects of Hindu Nationalism, the evidence of its progress and the chances of its future growth.

REFORM OR REVIVAL

We thought that with the fall of the old class of Pandits we had done with those wars of words which were formerly carried on with all the weight of great learning and accompanied by a demonstrative show of deep erudition, but we had evidently counted without our hosts, the great body of Indian reformers that are the products of English education, who owe nothing to the old school of Pandits and for whom the old school of Pandits have incurred no responsibility whatever. Before the spread of English education in this country there were only two classes of public literary or intellectual entertainments to which the people were treated now and then and which supplied some diversion from the otherwise dull, monotonous or in some places extremely hazardous lives which they generally led. The one was the most popular and useful practice of reciting the *kathas* to mixed and general audience consisting of all classes of people from old men to boys and

from old ladies to young girls. The ancient epics of the land—the chronicles of the life of Rama and his consort, and the great *Mahabharata*—were very often the books that were thus recited.

These *kathas* were greatly instrumental in keeping the national spark alive through so many vicissitudes of national fortune, when on occasions it had almost reached the point of total extinction. The second were the periodical religious discussions, which in most instances originated with the advent of a learned Pandit from the outside.

Very often the new Pandit's discourse had caught the popular ears and the local Pandit or Pandits thought that their dignity, prestige and even emoluments were in danger, to prevent which calamity they considered it their duty to come out and give a challenge to the newly arrived, to prove his superiority in the knowledge of the *shastras* by an open discussion Or it might be that the newcomer thought his success depended on drawing out the local theologian and giving him a defeat. Be it as it may, the invariable result was that the discussion began with words, the accuracy of certain expressions used by one or the other, the applicability or the non-applicability of certain rules of grammar and ended often if not always in words and sometimes in blows. I am sorry to observe that the present quarrel over "reform or revival" between the reformers seems to me to resemble, at least in parts, the above mentioned wordy polemics between the Pandits. The reformers claim to be the leaders of the community. They have occupied the place of the Pandits and divines of former times. They profess to lay down rules for the guidance of the general mass of people. They are agreed that the state of Hindu society is bad and rotten, that it needs great and radical changes and that without these changes the whole social fabric stands in danger of giving way and burying the nation down in its debris. They have remedies, ready, patent and infallible. On most of these they agree, only to differ on the name by which the same is to be styled. Their agreement as to the remedy disappears in their differences about the wordy habitat to be given to the proposed and contemplated changes. One class of people who have

already established a name for themselves do not like to give up the name they have patented and by which they have gained distinction. These latter gentlemen call themselves reformers and insist upon certain social changes being introduced in the name of "reform" and reform only. The other class who have lately come into prominence call themselves "revivalists', and they swear that any change in the social customs and institutions of the community can only be introduced under the shadow of revival. They think they cannot tolerate reform. The result is that while the former taunt the latter as "revivalists and reactionaries", the latter mock the former as "reformers and revolutionists". Both classes contain amongst them great and good men, men with pure motives and noble intentions. They are generally prominent men—well read and deep in the lore of history. Both classes are in all appearances sincere in their convictions and efforts, but to the great misfortune of the country and the nation they cannot join their heads and work amicably. The wordy weapons are sometimes changed, and while the reformers take their stand on "reform on rational lines", the revivalists plead for "reform on national lines". Here for once at least they seem to agree on reform, as the force of the difference is centred on the words "rational" and "national". The result is that much ink and paper are uselessly spent in dilating upon the necessary soundness of reform and the danger and risk of revival, and *vice versa.* Unfortunately no one ever sees and deplores the great waste of valuable time and precious energy which this quarrel involves—time and energy which could be usefully employed in, say, which is imperatively demanded by so many other things that are the *sine qua non* of national progress and that should be done but are not done from want of working hands On both sides are arrayed tongue warriors armed with the knowledge and experience which is gathered by deep study and growing years. On both sides are arrayed sturdy and stout soldiers possessed of and carried by the enthusiasm of youth, full of ambition, and proud of credentials gained by academical successes and literary achievements. On both sides the pen and the tongue are being used with strength and vigour not totally devoid of grace. It is very perilous to come between such daring, bold and de-

termined fighters specially for a comparatively ill-provided and poorly circumstanced man like myself who can wield neither the pen with the dexterity that comes of practice, nor the tongue with that skill which is the outcome of discipline. In fact, I am rather inclined to think that it is positively dangerous for recruits who have not had the advantage of regular lessons in drill or of the discipline that comes out of exercises at the manoeuvres, to interfere between such veteran combatants. But the interests at stake are so great, the field is so vast, the workers in the field are so few and far between, the amount of energy available is so little and the resources are so limited, that on better thought I have decided to take the risk and raise my voice against what to me looks sheer waste of opportunities and misapplication of energy.

I will begin by examining into the respective programmes of reformers and the revivalists and see if there are any vital and real differences which justify so much contemptous talk of each other. On both sides, I believe that the social reform programme begins and very rightly too, with the question of early marriage. I confess I am unaware of any radical difference between the views of the reformers and the revivalists on the point. In provinces other than the Punjab Mrs. Besant is believed to be the leader of the latter. Now, who does not know that she is opposed to early marriages and denounces them as unshastric and disastrous ? She has in fact taken pains not only to definitely pronounce against this evil custom, but to give force to her utterances, has shut the doors of a department of her school at Benares against those who might have been or might be by the improvidence of their guardians married at a tender age. The Arya Samajists also may to a certain extent be called revivalists, but in this matter of early marriage and the marriageable ages of boys and girls they go a step further than even the most radical reformer is prepared to just now. They say and preach, and try to enforce their precept, that no girl be married under 16 and no boy under 25. Now let us ask if there is anything irrational in saying that the institution of child-marriage is not only condemnable by reason, but is actually opposed to the letter as well as the spirit

of the Shastras. From the question of child-marriage we may proceed to the great evil of the present divisions and sub-divisions of caste. Mrs. Besant and her school have already pronounced against the sub-divisions in the main castes. Her defence of the original Hindu conception of four castes principally coincides with the views of the Arya Samajists in the matter and practically knocks the present caste system on the head, though in theory only. In practice neither the Arya Samajists nor the reformers can go further than denunciation. All of them agree that a beginning should be made with the sub-divisions. The sub-divisions having been swept away (which is not likely to be achieved very soon or very easily) the time will then come to think of the remoulding or the fusion of the main castes on shastric or rational lines. For the present we are all agreed that the existing arrangement is an unmixed evil, and the sooner it is done away with the better. From castes let us proceed to the question of foreign travel, and here again we find a practical unanimity. Of course, there are and there shall continue to be ultra-orthodox people who will not give up their opposition to any of these measures and will continue to say that they are un-Hindus; but just now we are not concerned with them, as we dare say there is no one who can justly or even contemptuously be called a revivalist who condemns foreign travel on the plea of revival and no reform. Then let us take up the great question of female education. I know of no sensible man in the country, not to speak of the revivalists only, who is a man of culture and education, who is opposed to it. The school of Mrs. Besant, the Arya Samajists, and the reformers are all pledged to it. There may be and there are practical difficulties in the way of educating our girls and sisters and wives, but nobody questions the desirability, nay the necessity, of giving, if possible, the very highest education to girls. People may differ on the *modus operandi* or may have different views about schemes of education to be enforced in the case of females, but there are no two opinions on the question of principle. There may be some among the so-called revivalists who are not favourably disposed to an exact copy of European customs and usages relating to females being adopted by the Hindus, but surely there is none who can in the name of revival defend the exist-

ing Purdah system or the universal ignorance of women. Similarly we do not think there is much difference of opinion at least so far as practical measures feasible at present are concerned, on the necessity of raising the social status and buttering the condition of low castes, if Hinduism is not bent upon social indifference and mad neglect of vital interests which might result in disastrous consequences. With the exception of some apparently spurious passages in Manu and other Smritis, there is absolutely nothing in the more ancient literature to justify the inhuman and cruel treatment to which the low castes are at present or were till lately subjected. We think we have almost exhausted the list of prominent subjects comprised in the list of reforms advocated by the social reformers, having reserved one important matter to be discussed last, *viz.*, the question of widow remarriage.

On this question there exists undoubtedly real difference of opinion between the so-called reformers and the so-called revivalists. We grant that the question is a very important one ; but slill we are not prepared to admit that a difference on this single question justifies all that bitterness which characterises the writings of these two classes about one another. The real and important differences are on questions of religion and worship which the social reformers profess to exclude from their curriculum of school and college education. Here in the Punjab, fortunately we have been spared that bitter fight over these words which is going on in the Western and Southern Presidencies, although we are not unaware that of late attempts have not been wanting to introduce it in collegiate and inter-collegiate debates. We cannot but deprecate these unwise attempts and will warn our young men from throwing themselves into the vortex of this absolutely unnecessary and uncalled for fight over words. We may be pardoned for pointing out that to us the fight seems to be generally on the same lines and on the same grounds which marked the polemics of the old class of Pandits. The real truth is that the so-called reformers are mostly in faith and in religion Brahmos. They were the earliest in the field and fought for reform when the revivalists had not yet come into existence. The revivalists are the

products of a wider diffusion of Sanskrit literature which has taken place principally within the last quarter of a century. This study has afforded them sufficient and strong evidence or their ancestors having enjoyed a great and glorious civilization from which most of the present evil practices and customs that are the bane of modern Hinduism were absent. They, therefore, naturally look to the past for light and guidance and plead that a revival might lead them into heaven of progress which is the object of all. They have found that most of the social evils that existing in their society were not to be found in the ancient Hindu race and they have, therefore, begun to appeal to the authority of the past and the Shastras for the introduction of these very reforms for which reformers had been pleading with much force though with scanty success on grounds of utility and natural justice. The revivalists are naturally popular in Hindu society as they take their stand on the authority of the Hindu Shastras and thus threaten to oust the reformers from their hard earned position. Then to add insult to injury, their exposition of the popular religious beliefs of the Hindus is so injurious and cunning as to justify a reasonable fear in the minds of the reformers that they are taking the nation back to superstitions and low and bebased forms of worship from which English education, content with Western religion, and a study of the masterminds of the West was just extricating them with so desirable a success. The reformers had thus based their religious propaganda on the same basis on which their social programme rested *viz.*, grounds of rationality. The revivalists having taken to the defence of the so-called national, have extended the same base to the removal of social evils and thus the fight began between "reform on national lines" and "reform on rational lines." But, as I have pointed out above, so far as real social reform is considered, both lines of work lead to a common conclusion. It is not, therefore, fair to entangle social reform in this quarrel which is really based on differences in religious views. Let the 'reformers' by all means if they like, ridicule the religious views of "the revivalists"; and criticise or hold them to derision, but it is not, to say the least, graceful and fair to talk of them contemptuously in matters of social reform. The same should we say to the revivalists. Happily here in the Punjab, as we have already

said, there is not much difference between reform and revival. By far the strongest reforming agency in the Punjab appears to accept both. To them reform is revival and revival is reform. It is true they attach much importance to nationality or to national lines, but subject to the important proviso *that they are not irrational*. The Arya Samajists shall have nothing *irrational* though it may even have the look of being national. They want everything national which is rational as well. They even go in for things national if only they are not irrational ; but no further. According to them nothing can be either national or rational which is against the letter or the spirit of the Vedas. So far there seems to be no danger of the Punjab being involved in this meaningless distinction between reform and revival, but we think it is better to take time by the forelock and sound this note of warning to guard against any contemplated or impending mischief. But over the above that, it is our earnest request to the leaders of the Hindu community in the Western and the Southern provinces to abjure this absurd distinction and to work harmoniously for social reform, at least so far as all are agreed upon. Lately I had occasion to listen to an address on social progress by an esteemed friend of mine who is a pronounced social reformer. In the course of his remarks he treated the revivalists with scant respect and in support of his views read the following quotation from the Amraoti speech of that great reformer—the late Mr. Justice Ranade :

"On the other side, some of our orthodox friends find fault with us, not because of the particular reforms we have in view, but on account of the methods we follow. While the new religious sects condemn us for being too orthodox, the extreme orthodox section denounces us for being too revolutionary in our method. According to these last, our efforts should be directed to revive and not to reform. I have many friends in this camp of extreme orthodoxy and their watchword is that revival and not reform should be our motto. They advocate a return to the old ways, and appeal to the old authorities and the old sanctions. Here also, as in the instance quoted above, people speak without realising the full significance of their own words. When we are asked to revive our institutions and customs, people seem to be very much at sea as to what it is

they seem to revive. What particular period of our history is to be taken as the old ? Whether the period of the Vedas, of the Smritis, of the Puranas, or of the Mahomedan or modern Hindu times ? Our usages have been changed from time to time by a slow process of growth, and, in some cases, of decay and corruption, and we cannot stop at a particular period without breaking the continuity of the whole. When my revivalist friend presses his argument upon me, he has to seek recourse in some subterfuge which really furnishes no reply to the question. What shall we revive ? Shall we revive the old habits of our people when the most sacred of our caste indulged in all the abominations, as we now understand them, of animal food and drink which exhausted every section of our country's zoology and botany ? The men and gods of those old days ate and drank forbidden things to excess in a way no revivalist will now venture to recommend. Shall we revive the twelve forms or sons, or eight forms of marriage which include capture, and recognised mixed and illegitimate intercourse ? Shall we revive the Niyoga system of procreating sons on our brothers' wives when widowed ? Shall we revive the old liberties taken by the Rishis and by the wives of the Rishis with the marital tie ? Shall we revive the hecatombs of animals sacrificed from year's end to year's end, and in which human beings were not spared as propitiatory offerings. Shall we revive the *shakti* worship of the left hand with its indecencies and practical debaucheries ? Shall we revive the *sati* and infanticide customs, or the flinging of living men into the rivers, or over rocks, or hookswings, or the crushing beneath Jagannath car ? Shall we revive the internecine wars of the Brahmans and Kshatriyas or the cruel persecution and degradation of the aboriginal population ? Shall we revive the custom of many husbands to one wife or of many wives to one husband ? Shall we require our Brahmans to cease to be landlords and gentleman, and turn into beggars and dependents upon the king as in olden times ? These instances will suffice to show that the plan of reviving the ancient usages and customs will not work out salvation, and is not practicable. If these usages were good and beneficial, why were they altered by our wise ancestors ? If they were bad and injurious, how can any claim be put forward for their restoration after so many ages ?

Besides, it seems to be forgotten that in a living organism as society is, no revival is possible. The dead and the buried or burnt are dead, buried, and burnt once for all, and the dead past cannot, therefore, be revived except by a reformation of the old materials into new organised beings."

Now, if it be permissible for a comparatively young and inexperienced man without laying himself open to a charge of disrespect for one of our revered leaders whose great wisdom, deep learning, and general judicial-mindedness are accepted all around. I will, with due deference to the late Mr. Ranade, beg to point out the injustice of the observations quoted above. Cannot a revivalist, arguing in the same strain, ask the reformers into what they wish to reform us ? Whether they want us to be reformed on the pattern of the English or the French ? Whether they want us to accept the divorce laws of the Christian society or the temporary marriages that are now so much in favour in France or America ? Whether they want to make men of our women by putting them into those avocations for which nature never meant them ? Whether they want us to substitute the legal *niyoga* of the Mahabharata period with the illegal and immoral *niyoga* that is nowadays rampant in European society ? Whether they want us to reform into Sunday drinkers of brandy and promiscuous eaters of beef ? In short, whether they want to revolutionise our society by an outlandish imitation of European customs and manners and an undiminished adoption of European vice ? The revivalists do not admit that the institutions which they want to revive are dead, burnt and gone. The very fact that they wish to revive them goes to show that they believe that there is still some life left in them and that, given the proper remedy, their present unhealthy and abnormal state is sure to disappear and result in the bringing about of the normal and healthy condition of affairs. In fact, in an earlier part of the same address, Mr. Ranade summed up the position of the revivalists in a few well chosen and apt words when he admitted that, "In the case of our society especially, the usages which at present prevail amongst us are admittedly not those which obtained in the most glorious periods of our history. On most of the points which are included in our programme, our own record of the

past shows that there has been a decided change for the worse and it is surely within the range of practical possibilities for us to hope that we may work up our way back to a better state of things without stirring up the rancorous hostilities which religious differences have a tendency to create and foster." It is exactly this working up our way back which the revivalists aim at. No revivalist has ever pleaded for the institutions selected by Mr. Justice Ranade as the butt end of his attack against them.

The real significance of these words—"reform" and "revival", if any, seems to be in the authority or authorities from which the reformers and the revivalists respectively seek their inspiration for guidance in social matters. The former are bent on relying more upon reason and the experience of European society, while the latter are disposed to primarily look at their Shastras and the past history, and the traditions of their people and the ancient institutions of the land which were in vogue when the nation was at the zenith of its glory. On our part we here in the Punjab are prepared to take our inspiration from both these sources, though we prefer to begin with the latter and call in the assistance of the former mainly to understand and explain what is not clear and ambiguous in the latter. But so long as our conclusions are principally the same, I think the fight is not worth being continued and may be dropped for good.

THE ONE PRESSING NEED OF INDIA

A question has often haunted us, asleep or awake, as to why is it that notwithstanding the presence amongst us of great, vigorous and elevating religious truths, and of the very highest conception of morality, we have been a subject race, held down for so many centuries by sets of people who were neither physically nor spiritually nor even intellectually so superior to us as *a fortiori* to demand our subjection.

We do not require a Herbert Spencer to tell us that the social efficiency of a social organism, as such, depends upon the sense of social responsibility amongst the members of such an

organism. The greater and the intenser the sense of responsibility amongst the individual members, regarding the safety and the welfare of the whole, the greater and the stronger the efficiency of the organism.

It is precisely this sense which is wanting in us and which stands in our way as a nation. Physically we are the equals of any people on earth. Barring those high class Hindus who think their glory consists in weak constitutions, delicate limbs and womanly features or who are given to determine their position in society by the amount of fat on their body and by the amount of physical inactivity which attends their business in life, the majority of our countrymen possess fine physiques and are able to withstand any amount of hardship and struggle. Even with the little they get to satisfy their animal wants, with their coarse food, scanty clothing and ill-ventilated and excessively crowded homesteads, they produce a soldiery which ranks amongst the best in the world. Whether it be the Rajput, the Jat, the Sikh, the Gurkha, the Purbia, the Marahtta, or the Punjabi Mussalman, the view expressed above holds equally good in the case of all. All of them have by turns, earned the highest praises of military experts under whom they had occasion to serve beneath the British flag. Whatever may be said of the many mistakes of head and heart by which they lost their own battles before the advent of the British, no one can question their bravery and valour. History is full of their deeds. Intellectually too, given the opportunities, the sons of India have given no occasion to shame their mother country. The Hindu civilization, the Buddhistic achievements are standing monuments of their high intellectual calibre. Under Mohammadan rule as well, when according to the celebrated Alberuni, the elite of the Hindu community sought the safety of the remotest and the farthest parts of the country to be secure from the molestation of the fanatically disposed Mohammadans, the country continued to produce intellectual giants whose names still shed luster on the country of their birth. Under the British, too, with the few opportunities that are possessed by the Indian scholar to distinguish himself, the country has produced a Bose, a Ramchandra, a Paranjpe, a Ranade and many others whose names are the common

property of all Indians. Then if we look to the domain of religion we stand almost unequalled. What other country in Europe can show the equals of the unknown authors of the *Upanishads*, Buddha, and Shankracharya ? From religion if we come down to the regions of philosophy, where in one country could we find such a galaxy of truth loving, honest and bolder thinkers as the immortal authors of the six *Darshanas*, and some of their commentators and elucidators ? Again, glancing at the history of chivalry and noble deeds, does not the history of the Rajputs read like a romance ? When then, are we so low in the scale of nations ? What is it that keeps us down and does not allow us to raise our head above the waters ? We are not wanting in flexibility or adaptability. Where on earth will you find another case parallel to Hinduism ? Notwithstanding twelve centuries of Islamic propaganda backed by all the forces of political ascendancy and of that moral superiority which is the author sheet of a virgin religion and a conquering creed ; notwithstanding again of 100 years of active evangelical work done in the name of Christ by devoted missionaries, Hinduism still reigns supreme in the land and baffles all attempts made from time to time, to displace and overthrow it. How is it then, that with all the education we have received during the one century of British rule, with frantic professions of patriotism that are the natural result of a knowledge of our degradation and helplessness, with wild cries of nationality in danger, with pathetic appeals for reforms in the administration of the country, we have so far failed to gain anything substantial in our quest after national liberty ? How is it that our cries make no impression, our appeals go unheeded and our professions turn to be of no avail ? While sparing no occasion or means of criticising Government measures, very often offering right and sensible criticism, with that amount of persistency which sometimes we show, we are yet powerless to obtain even the smallest measure to reform either in constitution or in administration, or even of remedial justice ? While leaving the political sphere aside, how is it that even in matters of social reform which being in our hands no Government prevents us from giving effect to, we have so far failed to achieve that amount of success which Herculean efforts of men like Ram Mohun Roy, Dayanand Saraswati,

Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar and Mahadeva Govind Ranade deserved ? The reply is the same as we have already given above. We are individuallly wanting in that sense of social responsibility which requires each and every member of the organism to place the interests of the community or the nation over and above those of his own. Amongst us selfishness, greed and calculation reign supreme. Most of us cannot even think of the society or the nation. But even those who can think and do profess to care for them do not care a farthing for the same, when their individual interests seem to clash with the interests of the society. Most of us, including some of the very highly educated men, who do not fail to exhibit often an unpardonable pride in the amount of learning locked in their brains, who very readily spend hours in finding fault with the commas and semi-colons of less gifted brethren, who do not fail to parade their knowledge of the philosophy of Herbert Spencer, of the science of Huxley or of the fine poetic genius of a Shelley or a Tennyson are utterly devoid of a sense of social responsibility.

We know that men who denounced the institution of child marriage in the vehement language they could command, were at the same time conscious of the fact that they had themselves already fixed a date for the marriage of their seven years aged girl with a boy of a similarly tender age. We have known men whose professions of patriotism were often the most profuse giving a point blank refusal to any demand of help for any national institution. We have known of great patriots rolling in wealth, possessing palatial residences, enjoying the blessing of a good fixed income, never moving their finger to reduce misery that was next door to them. We have seen great patriotic Indians passing by in a spirit of perfect indifference, when another countryman of theirs was being cruelly beaten by a European. No Indian is supposed to make any move that pays or benefits him in cash or in kind in any way. If you go to a gentleman to ask him to join such and such association or to do such and such a thing, the question that he puts to you or if he has not the courage to do so openly, to himself, is what shall he gain thereby ? We know that people give subscriptions, attend meetings, join Associations and Samajes and

do a lot of other things that have the look of public spirit or national help but how many of them, may we ask, except when moved by religion, do so by a sense of public duty and individual responsibility for the national cause? It is very unpleasant to speak ill of one's own countrymen or to appear to be ungrateful to those estimable gentlemen who do keep public movements going but to be truthful we shall be failing in our duty if we were to pretend a belief in their patriotism. It is our firm belief that if the country could have claimed the one-tenth part of that patriotism which is often paraded and assumed, the state of things would have been different and no Government could have ignored the existence or the demands of such patriotism. But the facts are otherwise; not that the social ideals taught by our religion are low and mean, not that this rank selfishness and base calculation of self-interest is countenanced by the teachings of our great men, not that this sense of national and public duty is entirely absent from the teachings of our Shastras. No. Political degradation for so long has practically extinguished the very germs of this noble sentiment from our blood. Our immediate ancestors did not possess it, so we could not inherit it from them. As for its inculcation from without we are sorry that the advantages of Western culture have not been unmixed. While very few have imbibed its noble sentiments, a large number have taken and adopted in life its materialistic tendencies. We know that we require the latter too, rather badly, but we cannot forget that, if we once allow ourselves to be possessed of these only without the other necessary and counteracting tendencies, we are done for. The country may grow rich, it may extend its commerce, it might even begin to manufacture for other countries; but unless all this is accompanied by a sense of public duty in the people of this country, all this will not avail us, nay, might be the very foundation of future fall, if further fall is yet possible. Yes, we want all this, but first and foremost of all we want the habit and sense of subordinating our individual interests before the interests of the community at large In short, what we pre-eminently want is that every Indian may be sufficiently patriotic and dutiful to believe and act up to the belief that the interests of the country are paramount and must override

all private considerations. We want this to be regularly taught as the highest religion that will bring about the salvation of India. To promulgate this we want faithful and true preachers who may be living examples of their propaganda and who can show the power of their faith in their own persons. Let each province produce a number of such preachers and we are convinced that patriotism will gain firm ground in the country and the cause of nationality will advance with leaps and bounds. Without this we may go on crying for decades and decades, but we shall not advance an inch.

SWADESHI MOVEMENT

It is commonly supposed that there are two sides of the Swadeshi movement, one the political and the other the economic. Pure Swadeshi, as some of the Anglo-Indians choose to call it, is an economic movement and they profess to have a great sympathy for the same. Boycott of foreign made goods is held to be a political weapon upon the uses and ethics of which there is a great divergence of opinion. The Anglo-Indians can see nothing but mischief in it. In their opinion it is morally wrong, politically pernicious and economically unsound and impracticable. But there are a number of Europeans and Americans who see nothing pernicious in it and consider it to be not only a perfectly legitimate weapon but a very powerful and effective one to bring pressure upon any imperial race having commerce as its principal business. Amongst the Indians themselves different classes of people look at it from different points of view. Firstly, there is that class who can never see differently from their Anglo-Indian patrons. The opinions of this class do not count for much and need not be considered at all Secondly, there are those who both by nature and habit are in favour of peace at any cost. They cannot approve of any methods which are calculated to cause the least disturbance in the relations of the different persons and communities, whether Indians or aliens, who are in some way or other interested in India. These good people have great faith in moral persuasion and prayers—prayers addressed to the Great Ruler of the Universe as well as to our rulers in affairs mundane. They believe that

a combined force of these two is sure to bring about a quiet, bloodless, moral revolution in India which will set matters right and remove all the political disqualifications and disabilities from which the Indians at present suffer and which result in so much hardship, oppression and wrong to the people of this country.

Personally I am a believer in the efficacy of prayer as an instrument of religious discipline but it will require a great stretch of imagination and inconceivable amount of credulity on my part to accept that prayer to the Almighty, coupled with prayers to the ruling nation, are likely to lead to any practicable results in matters political and international. Prayers to the Almighty may be useful in intensifying your desire for political liberty and political privileges. Prayers to the ruling nation may be useful to you in proving the uselessness of appealing to the higher sense of man in matters political, where the interests of one nation clash with those of another and in driving you to the conclusion that human nature, constituted as it is, extremely selfish and is not likely to change or bend unless the force of circumstances compels it to do so in spite of itself. But beyond this I cannot pin my faith on prayers. The third class of Indians consists of those estimable gentlemen who believe in the righteousness of the British nation as repreented by the electors of Great Britain and Ireland and who are afreaid of offending them by the boycott of English made goods. If there are any two classes into which the British nation can roughly be divided they are either manufacturers or the working men. Both of them are interested in keeping the Indian market open for the sale and consumption of their manufactures. Any movement aiming at the closing or contracting of this market is sure to offend them. They are said to be our only friends to whom we can appeal against the injustice of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy. Offend them, say these friends, and you are undone. You lose the goodwill of the only class who can help you and who are prepared to listen to your grievances. But these good friends forget that, boycott or no boycott, any movement calculated to increase the manufacturing power of India is likely to incur the displeasure of the British Elector.

The latter is a very well educated animal, a keen man of business who can at once see through things that are likely to affect his pocket, however, cleverly they might be put or arranged by those who hold an interest which is really adverse to his. He is not likely to be hood-winked by the cry of Swadeshi *minus* the boycott, because really speaking and effectively worked and organised both are one and the same.

The Swadeshi aims at the production of those articles at home which are at present imported from abroad. The boycott means the discontinuance of the consumption of those articles not made in this country. So far, then, it is not likely to be of much use to drop the boycott in order to secure for us the continuation of the friendly attitude of the British Elector. But then we may go step further and maintain that up till now the alleged friendliness of the British Elector has been of no good to us. Past experience shows that they have more than once stood between the people of India and some of its more noble-minded Anglo-Indian rulers whenever the latter tried to obtain economic justice for the former. The latter from their knowledge of the growing seriousness of the economic situation in India have now and then made a bold stand for justice to India against the demands of the British manufacturer, but they have almost always had to give in because the latter proved too strong for them. Here then we are on the horns of a dilemma. To our wrongs the British Elector is indifferent, to our rights, even if supported by good Englishmen in India, they have been opposed. The British Elector has no doubt a sympathetic ear to the tales of wrong and oppression that you may carry to England but unfortunately he is too busy and too absorbed in his own affairs to spare any time to listen to your tales or to take a serious view of them. The burden of the empire is too heavy to be conveniently shifted from the shoulders of a few—magnificently paid for the work—to those of the English people. The struggle for wealth, for luxury, is too keen and too intense to leave the latter any leisure or inclination for the study of the ethics of imperialism. Under the circumstances the sympathy of the British Elector is for the present at least a negligible quantity. The question directly put comes to this ;—are the

British prepared to give us full political privileges in exchange for open markets for their goods ? Any attempt to answer this in the affirmative must be put down as chimerical. But even granting that the argument has some force, is it not worth our while to impress upon the Britons at home the enormity of the wrongs inflicted upon us by their representatives here in this country, by supplementing the Swadeshi by boycott ? Admitting that Englishmen at home have the power to set matters right how are you to force their attention to the state of things in India except by directly threatening their pockets ? The logic of losing business is more likely to impress this nation of shopkeepers than any arguments based on the ethics of justice and fair-play. The British people are not a spiritual people. They are either a fighting race or a commercial nation. It will be like throwing pearls before swine to appeal to them in the name of higher morality or justice or on ethical grounds. They are a self-reliant, haughty people, who can appreciate self-respect and self-reliance even in their opponents. It is then for the Indians to decide whether they mean to continue to appeal to them in the name of political justice, fair play or whether they intend to attract their attention to the existing intolerable condition of things in India by inflicting losses in business and by adopting an attitude of retaliatory self-reliance.

But then there is another class of Indians who tread on more solid ground than any of those spoken of above. This is the class who oppose the boycott on economic grounds. Here we feel we are on more substantial ground. There is no plea of expediency, nor does it arise out of fear of the authorities in India or of the British Elector at home. Their warning note has a scientific basis and deserves the most careful and attentive consideration of all patriotic Indians. Whether Free Trader or Protectionist, you cannot dismiss them off-hand nor treat their reasoning with contempt. They may be fadists (a term which in their turn they apply to Swadeshists) but they are neither cowards nor traitors. Speaking for myself I am an out and out Swadeshist and have been so for the last twenty-five years, in fact ever since I learnt for the first time the true meaning of the word patriotism. For me the words Swadeshi and patriotism are synonymous though I do not maintain or

insinuate that those who are free-traders are not patriots. I advisedly do not say "not Swadeshists," because I am not prepared to say that those Indians who are free-traders are not necessarily Swadeshists. Be it as it may, I am personally inclined to attach the greatest importance possible to the Swadeshi movement. I look upon it as the remedy upon the right and on continued use of which depends the alleviation of the sufferings of our country. I regard it as the salvation of my country. The Swadeshi ought to make us self-respecting, self-reliant, self-supporting, self-sacrificing and last, but not least, manly. The Swadeshi ought to teach us how to organise our capital, our resources, our labour, our energies and our talents to the greatest good of all Indians, irrespective of creed, colour or caste. It ought to unite us—our religious and denominational differences notwithstanding It ought to furnish us with an altar before which we can all stand in the fullest sincerity of our hearts and in the deepest strength of faith to pray for the good of our common motherland, with a determination to stand together and work together. In my opinion the Swadeshi ought to be the common religion of United India. But all this notwithstanding, as a practical Swadeshist, I want a better understanding of the economic needs and requirements of the country and a practical programme of industrial development based on scientific calculations. As an indication of the lines upon which I shall like this programme to be framed, I cannot do better than quote from a very famed paper, from the Journal of the Royal Economic Society of London for the month of March 1906, under the heading of 'Protection of Infant Industries.' Discussing the economic effects of a protective tariff the writer remarks :

"We see that when the import of goods is checked, the exchanges are affected in a way which tends to raise prices at home ; and that this arise continues until importation is again possible, unless such heavy duties are imposed that the country can be cut off both from importation and from exportation, and so become entirely self-contained. We find also in this process the explanation of the fact that the relief afforded by a protective tariff is frequently of a somewhat temporary character. Fo a few months the home producer has the field to

himself; then his costs of production gradually rise; at last he finds foreign competition pressing on him once more; and finally he falls back upon the fatal demand for more Protection.

'But this—the common course of protection in both the new and the old countries—is not the only possible course in theory. It is caused, so far as I can see, principally by the attempt to do too much at once. Your new country is inclined to be generous to its home manufacturers, and to start manufacturing in all lines at once; by so doing it fritters away energy, and spreads expenditure over a wide field which if concentrated might produce imposing results.

"For, supposing that a new country would consent to do one or two things at a time, its difficulties would probably be far less. If it started, for instance, by attempting to found one textile or one branch of metallurgical industry, it could afford to give to its infant for a few years a genuine and important assistance. Gold prices would, of course, still be to some extent affected, but in an infinitely smaller degree than when a dead set is made against all manufactured goods at once. And by concentrating the money which is available on one end instead of dividing it among several hundreds more real progress would indubitably be made. After all, under modern conditions, no industry ought to remain an infant for more than five years: during those years it probably needs more assistance than can be easily given it under a general Protective system; later on, the less help it has, the better.

"Other important gains could be made—both political and economic—by this system of concentration In the first place, the opportunities for log-rolling would certainly be diminished. If the system were once established, a most salutary division of the protectionist forces would assuredly take place; as it is, the tendency in many countries is for everybody to favour protection on the off chance that he may make more by it than he loses: on the system proposed everybody would know that only one or two industries were to be protected at a time, and those only for a few years. Again, the present certainly that a protective system will last much longer than there is any need

for it, would be removed. For, as only one or two industries would receive help at any one time, all the other industries would combine to reduce that time to a minimum in the hope that their turn would come next."

In my opinion, the leaders of the Swadeshi movement including men actually engaged in business ought to put their heads together and promulgate an industrial pronouncement for the next five years, prepared on the lines indicated in the above extract.

INDIAN PATRIOTISM TOWARDS THE EMPIRE

In May last (1906) the Director of Public Instruction of the Punjab issued a circular order to all the headmasters and managers of Government, aided and unaided schools in the Province, requiring them to celebrate the Empire-day in a certain way. One of the items of the programme laid down by him for observance was "the recitation of Urdu poems on loyalty to the Crown of England and patriotism towards the Empire." We do not know if the head of the Punjab Education Department was responsible for the wording of the above clause. The document seemed to bear on it abundant marks of that jingo statesmanship which has for a number of years been in ascendancy in the councils of the British Empire. One thing, however, is clear. The Government was sensible enough not to declare the Empire-day as a public holiday. The compulsory celebration of the Empire day in 1906 was therefore confined to the schools, may be, to the schools of the Punjab only. We propose to examine in this paper if the step taken was educationally sound and in any way calculated to improve the moral tone of the schools where it was, by order, enforced.

Till lately the impression was that the British were, at least, frank by nature and valued frankness and sincerity on the part of others, however distasteful and unpleasant at times, these may be to their imperial temper. The idea was that although conscious of the unnaturalness of their rule over alien races, they aimed at making it as pleasant and benevolent as they possibly could (if ever it is possible to make subjection pleasant and benevolent) consistently with the making of the largest profit

out of it for themselves. Of course, nobody having sufficient experience of human nature ever took the Britisher at his word, when the latter professed to be moved by unselfish and altruistic motive in extending his rule over other nations and countries and governing them solely for the sake of humanity and civilization. All the same, people believed that the British administration had not lost all sense of frankness and sincerity, until the new doctrine of the white man's burden was propounded by the banjo-bards, and the jingo poets had forced their muse to sing of the great sacrifices which the white man underwent in his civilizing mission and his humane rule, undertaken for the sole benefit of the ruled. But even the jingoes, whether poets or statesmen, never thought of appealing to the subject races in the name of "Patrotism towards the Empire" for the simple reason that in the mouths of the latter the expression was an absurdity and a contradiction in terms. The subject races—the fact of whose subordination to Great Britain alone, confers upon the latter, the status and dignity of an Empire—may be loyal, whether, voluntarily or involuntarily, by free will, or by necessity, but to attempt to raise this sense of loyalty to the dignity of patriotism is sheer nonsense. No lexicographer, of any position whatsoever, will risk his reputation by speaking, even by inference of "Patriotism towards the Empire." The idea is monstrous and is for the first time being introduced into the English language by the presumptuous genius of the jingoes as an antidote towards the sacred sentiment of patriotism, in the development of which amongst the subject races, they see a dangerous enemy to their own despotic rule. The lexicographers, if they can be accepted as reliable guides, in explaining the meaning of English words to us, almost unanimously agree in expressing the general opinion as to patriotism signifying "love of country." Johnson defines it as "zeal for one's country" and Webster as "the passion which aims to serve one's country." The *Encyclopaedic Dictionary* says that patriotism is "devotion to the interest and welfare of one's country" and the *Century Dictionary* as "the passion which moves a person to serve his country either in defending it from invasion or protecting its rights and maintaining its land and institutions" and so on and so forth. But how can a subject

race governed by another be patriotic towards its rulers passes one's comprehension, unless one accepts the theory that the latter rules solely for the benefit of the former ? Even in this case it is love of his own country and certainly not patriotism towards the empire (signifying love for the empire) which evokes loyalty for the existing government. Honestly speaking the two sentiments are antagonistic, *viz.* loyalty to a foreign government and love for one's country, which is patriotism ; unless the patriot is to reconcile his patriotism with loyalty by the idea that in loving the foreign ruler he loves his own country. It may be allowable to a patriot to soothe his conscience by identifying his loyalty with patriotism, but to carry it further and to extend it to the empire is coining a new expression with an entirely new meaning. When, therefore, in the name of the Empire, the British appeal to the patriotism of the Indians instead of to their loyalty, their object is to give a higher pedestal to the shame which every member of a subject race (having the least vestige of self respect and honourable feeling in him) must feel at his political helplessness and at the political non-existence of his country. The object is to cover the shame of political bondage with the halo of glory that attaches to the word "patriotism" and thus to remove the sting that bites the consciences of those of the ruling race and puts to shame those among the ruled, as are still open to any sense of honour.

However commendable the motive and however praiseworthy the object may be, one does not require much common sense to see through the device. The fact is that human nature with all its inherent disposition towards selfishness is always apt to find excuses for its idiosyncracies and will not allow itself to be denied the pleasure of putting a gloss of high and pure motives on its basest and meanest acts, whereby it deprives others of the simplest rights of humanity and the priceless treasure of liberty. No wrong-doer, however educated and cultured he may be, can at times help feeling mortification at the wrongs which in the pursuit of self-interest he has inflicted or does inflict upon others, and it is then that his guilty conscience runs riot in search of pleas and justifications for his wrongful conduct. Makers and rulers of empires are no excep-

tion to this general rule, which governs human nature everywhere and in every phase of life. Now empires are neither made nor maintained by right. They are made by might, both physical and intellectual, including that diplomacy and cunning without which no supremacy can ever be gained over other peoples and nations. "Only by force can empire, as a rule, be created ; only by force can empire, as a rule, be maintained," rightly remarks Mr. Goddard in his excellent book on *Racial Supremacy*, although instances are not wanting in which wise and sagacious empire-makers and their equally clever successors have maintained empires for a longer period than they otherwise could, by doses of benevolence and justice in the management of their affairs. But racial supremacy is one of those necessary evils of which the world can never be purged. Its roots are deep. No amount of philosophizing and high thinking will see its complete overthrow from the world, and as long as this necessary evil exists, which is tantamount to saying that it must always exist, you cannot do away with empires and empire-makers. Still that is no reason why those who are the victims of empires and empire-makers should feel grateful to their masters for having extended their empire over them and for having included them in the category of their subjects. As to the ethics of empire-making and as to the claims of the British to the gratitude of those included in their empire, we will prefer to quote some English authorities on the subject rather than give expression to our own views.

First, as to what does "empire" signify ? In the language of Mr. J.G. Goddard, a member of the new House of Commons, it "simply means rule, dominion, sway." According to Lord Rosebery, empire is "the predominance of rule." According to Herbert Spencer, "not the derivation of the word only but all its uses and associations imply the thought of predominance—imply a correlative subordination. Actual or potential coercion of other individuals or communities is necessarily involved in the conceptions." In the words of Mr. Goddard then "imperialism is the spirit of rule, ascendancy or predominance ; the rule of one race of people by another race of people involving of course, the subjection of the former to the latter."

Mr. J.M. Robertson, another member of the House of Commons, also defines empire as "rule over other communities than his own." Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the jingo imperialist of modern England has, however, assured us that "the new conception of empire is of a voluntary organisation, based on community of interests and community of sacrifices, to which all should bring their contribution to the common good."

How far this is in accordance with existing facts has been made clear by Mr. Goddard in examining the above statement, in his book referred to above. In the opinion of this writer imperialism tends to demoralise the dominant race, while it is supply the bane of the subject races. Taking the case of India as the most prominent and pertinent instance of the government of one people by another people, he concludes by saying that India is ruled in the interest of the dominant race rather than in hers and endorses the well known remarks of John Ruskin that "every mutiny, every danger, every crime occurring under our Indian legislation arose directly out of our native desire to live on the loot of India." The writer further condemns imperialism on the ground that it is destructive of liberty and applying it to the case of India he pronounces an indictment on imperialism in this country in the following terms :

"Here we have countless millions denied the rights accorded to the English agricultural labourer, taxed to pay for a Government in which they have no voice, condemned to support an army they cannot control, rack-rented for land they cultivate mainly for the benefit of others, compelled to yield interest on an expenditure they did not make, and generally reduced to the condition of hewers of wood and drawers of water, with sufference as the badge of all their tribe".

Discussing the ethics of empire the same writer examines the claims of the dominant races in placing themselves in *quasi loco parentis* over subject races, as follows :

"The bond which unites father or mother with son and daughter is one of mutual affection and so far from self-sacrifice on the part of the dominant race being present, the opposite

Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland representing the British nation, for you can, at times, successfully appeal to the humanity and benevolence of individuals but to hope for justice and benevolence from a nation is hoping against hope. The rule of a foreign democracy is, in this respect, the most dangerous. The democracy is swayed by so many diverse interests and motives that it is simply impossible to expect anything like unanimity or even a preponderance of opinion in dealing justly with a subject race, because justice to a subject race often clashes or is inconsistent with the interest of some class of the ruling democracy. Whenever an attempt is, therefore, made to do justice to the former, the latter rise up, raise a storm and prevent the government from doing the right thing. Looking to the history of the cotton duties in India, every one will see the truth of my remarks. How many times have the Government of India been overruled in the matter, simply because the Home Government can not afford to risk the opposition of Lancashire and incur its displeasure ?

As a matter of fact, we are at present ruled by a democracy which represents the British nation and in the appointing and controlling of which the Sovereign has really no hand. In my opinion the benevolence of a whole nation seems to be nothing more than a myth and a fiction, as there can never be an absolute unanimity both as to what constitutes benevolence in given circumstances, as well as to how it is to be reduced into practice. Applying the benevolence plea to the case of India and other subject races of Britain, Mr. Goddard concludes (a conclusion with which other eminent authorities agree) that the plea is simply untenable. Examining the idea of benevolence in imperial relations in the light of historical facts Mr. Goddard says, "The truth is that whilst it does not necessarily give rise to exalting acts of cruelty, so far from its ever being largely tempered by benevolence, it has invariably one prominent characteristic, namely, the exploitation of its victims. The primary object and result of alien government is not to confer benefits upon the subject races but to obtain benefits from them." He further says that :

"Perhaps......the most striking testimony to the virtues of benevolent despotism is seen in the employment of native races

to fight our battles for us. Wild animals are sometimes lured to their doom by means of one of their kind trained to act as a decoy and we occasionally hear setting of a thief to catch a thief. The process has been adopted with a magnificent effrontery and a grim sense of humour to the needs of aggressive imperialism, and having extended the empire by bringing the "inferior races" under our sway, by a master stroke of genius, we utilise them to still further extend and also to defend the empire and convert them into instruments for bestowing upon their brethren the boons which they themselves have obtained. It is very largely in this way that our Indian Empire has been built up."

Then let us see what another English author, Mr. J.A. Hobson says about the sophistries of imperialism. "The idea", he says, "that we are civilising India in the sense of assisting them to industrial, political, and moral progress along the lines either of our own or their civilisation is a complete delusion, based upon a false estimate of the influence of superficial chances brought by government and the activity of a minute group of aliens. The delusion is only sustained by the sophistry of imperialism which weaves these fallacies to cover its nakedness and the advantages which certain interests suck out of empire," Even the late Professor Seeley writes in the same strain when he says : "We are not disposed to be proud of the succession of the Grand Moghul. We doubt whether with all the merits of our administration the subjects of it are happy. We may even doubt whether our rule is preparing them for a happier condition, whether it may not be sinking them lower in misery." But what Professor Seeley states in rather halting language is expressed affirmatively by another great writer on India, Mr. W.S. Lily. "The test of a people's prosperity", says Mr. Lily. "is not the extension of exports, the multiplication of manufactures or other industries, the construction of cities. No. A prosperous country is one in which the great mass of the inhabitants are able to procure with moderate toil what is necessary for living human lives, lives of frugal and assured comfort. Judged by this standard can India be called prosperous ?" His answer, of course, is a positive 'No.' He adds that "comfort is a relative term and that in a tropical country like

India the standard is very low......but millions of peasants in India are struggling to live on half an acre. Their existence is a constant struggle with starvation leading to often in defeat. Their difficulty is not to live human lives—lives up to the 'evel of their poor standard of comfort—*but to live at all and not die.*"

Such then is the verdict of level-headed Englishmen on the result of imperial rule of India, which testimony is of hundred times greater value than the interested sayings of stock exchange brokers and speculators, whom the British System helps in hoarding up millions upon millions at the cost of the Indian peasant, the Indian labourer and the Indian handicraftsman. I could add the testimony of many more Englishmen as to the baneful effects of imperialism in India, but the fear of adding to the bulk of this part of the paper prevents me from doing so and I will conclude this part of the paper by adding one more quotation from the fascinating work of Mr. Goddard, wherein he shows how detrimental benevolent imperialism is to the interests of the subject race :

"The gravamen of the indictment of "benevolent despotism" is that it tends to perpetuate the despotism. Whilst in practice the benevolence, if manifested at all, is relatively small, and whilst even if it were exhibited to the fullest extent circumstances admit, it would be no adequate justification ; its supposed or actual existence obscures the facts, satisfies the conscience, and leads to acquiescence in the permanent withdrawal of liberty, instead of efforts towards its restoration."

It will be seen that in saying all this I have only discussed the general effects of imperial rule in India and have not even touched upon particular grievances. I have made no allusion to the brutal treatment we receive in South Africa, Australia and other parts of the empire, and I have made no mention of the disabilities from which we suffer in India. Is it then right to ask us to celebrate the Empire-day ? Is it then likely to improve habits of sincerity ane truthfulness amongst our boys, by compelling them to glorify the empire ? Is it then honest on the part of our teachers and professors and directors to flatter us by saying that we are either the sons of the empire or its

citizens, while we are neither, but are treated as the subjects of the empire—the victims of the imperial spirit that rules? Britishers may or may not glory in their empire. Perhaps from the ordinary point of view they have every reason to be proud of it and to glory in it. It tickles their fancy to think of their possessions, their dependencies and their subjects, though the sober-minded amongst them have begun to talk loudly as to the evil effects of imperialism on the morale of their own people. The once sturdy and vigorous, both in thought and in deed, the simple but the highminded, the reserved but solid Britisher is perhaps exchanging his virtues for the comforts, ease and luxuries, which attend an unchecked sway of empire and the bumptiousness and the vuglar pride of unbounded intoxication of uncontrolled power. Be however as it may, we do not and we cannot object to the Britisher at home or in India celebrating his Empire day, but it is nothing short of adding insult to injury to ask us and our boys to do so. Devoted patriots, as the British are, is it fair on their part to ask us to celebrate the Empire-day in the name of "Patriotism towards the Empire"—a patrictism which we do not feel, which does not inspire us with noble thoughts and which evokes neither love nor homage in our bosoms? As helpless victims of the aggressive imperialism, as servants of the Crown and as students of schools and colleges, we might silently put up with humlliation, but I dare say I am not wrong in reading the hearts of the bulk of my educated countrymen when I say, that the idea is simply revolting and extremely provoking to their sense of honour and shame. Those Britishers and Indians who thus trade in hypocrisy, and who thus would inoculate the minds of the innocent boys and girls with the serum of hypocrisy are doing a positive injury to human nature, and to the principles of sound education without doing any good to the British rule in India. In the name of loyality we are prepared to submit to any order which the authorities issue, but we earnestly beg of them not to drag our patriotism into the mire and not to force us to compromise the same. The demands of patriotism are sacred and ennobling, which require no hypocrisy, and which evoke the deepest feelings of love for our country and for our people.

ON SUSPENSION OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE MOVEMENT*

With the Bardoli resolutions our movement has reached a stage which makes it necessary to have a close searching of the hearts and a clear idea of where and how we stand. Within the last eighteen months, from September 1920 up to date of the Bardoli resolutions we have made several mistakes, both in principles and in practice, in premises as well as conclusion. These mistake ought to be openly acknowledged, atoned for and the responsibility for them placed on proper shoulders so that we may be in a position to chalk out our future course of conduct, with surer grasp of the realities of the situation than we have hitherto done.

Before I proceed to mention these mistakes and my share in them, I want to acknowledge as handsomely as I can the debt of gratitude we all owe to Mahatma Gandhi. He has made "Himalayan" blunders as he says and the country in general and we of the non-co-operation movement will share the suffering that is to result therefrom but if the balance-sheet of our losses and gains be prepared I have no hesitation in saying that we will find that on the whole we have considerably gained. His leadership and personal contact with him, has made us more truthful, more courageous, more self-sacrificing and simpler and purer, in the manner and habits of our living. He has brought home to us as no one else could, the value and virtue of living absolutely in the open, concealing nothing, hiding nothing, playing no tricks, no dodges which are ordinarily associated with political movements. He has taught us the value of absolute sincerity in our dealings with the people as well as the Government and the general conduct of the movement for freedom. He has also instilled in us a spirit of discipline, self-confidence and suffering in the cause of truth, which was somewhat lacking before. In any case under his leadership we have progressed in these virtues both

*Letter (from Lahore Central Jail) addressed by Lala Lajpat Rai to the members of the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress in February 1922, on receiving the news of the suspension of Non-co-operation Movement by Mahatma Gandhi.

quantitatively and qualitatively. His greatest service, however, lies in the closer understanding between Hindus and Mohamedans which has been brought under his aegis and inspiration. He has placed the Hindu-Muslim unity on a much higher and better plane than it had ever been attempted before by any other leader, living or dead. Some of us had been working in the cause of freedom and reform for decades before his appearance in the public life of the country but never did we come in contact with a leader of his personal magnetism, transparent honesty of purpose, absolute sincerity of intention, untiring and never ending fund of energy and almost limitless capacity for work under even the most harassing and distressing of circumstances. Spiritually, socially and even politically the country certainly stands much higher than it did before March, 1919. Never before in the experience of living men did a leader so successfully and unfailingly appreciate the genius of his people and felt their pulse as Mahatma Gandhi has done in the course of the last three years. I wonder, if ever in the history of India a single person has had so much influence over the masses of India as Mahatmaji acquired. I have no hesitation in saying not only that he is the greatest Indian living but that he is one of the greatest of men of all ages, all times and all countries. Yet that is exactly the reason why we have to swallow the bitter pill of ignominious defeat today, because, say what we may, we have been defeated and that too very badly. Our defeat is in proportion to the greatness of our leader. Several times and in several matters, in the course of the last eighteen months, we surrendered our better judgements to his decision.

Fundamentally we have been right all the time. Our mistakes have been mistakes more of calculation, of methods, of programme and of tactics than of principles. Fundamentally I still believe that Non-violent Non-co operation is the road that will lead us to our goal. I have all my life believed in Non-co-operation with a foreign government. It was left to Mahatma Gandhi to prefix "Non-violent" to it and to place it before the country in the form of an organised programme. This certainly improved the situation and the co-operation of a section of the great Muslim community made it workable. I

have no doubt in my mind that the road followed by our "moderate" countrymen is not the right road which will lead us to Swarajya. The experience of the last six months has only strengthened me in that belief. It was a harsh speech that I made in Bombay in May last. I am sorry for using certain expressions which caused pain to my moderate friends but in the main my reading of the situation was correct and it has been proved to be correct, by events that have happened within the last six months. The eminent Indians who have occupied high posts under the Government have completely identified themselves with the view-point of the bureaucracy. I maintain that in the circumstances they could not but do so. No one would have believed that men like Dr. Sapru, Mr. Chintamani, Pt. Jagat Narain, Mr. Setalvad, Mr. Rahmat Ullah, Raja of Mahmudabad, Mr. Joshi of Amraoti, Mr. Sinha of Patna, Babu S.N. Bannerji and others would have consented to apply the Criminal Law Amendment Act to an organisation like that of the Congress and Khilafat Volunteers and would have justified or excused all or nearly all that has been done by the bureaucracy in the name of law and order within the last six months. Two years before it would have been impossible to believe that all this would happen under the authority, sanction and approval of these eminent Indians. Yet this has come to pass. The rank and file of the moderate party have made a brave fight against bureaucratic methods of repression and for that fight all credit is due to them, that fight has not been of much use. On one side their own leaders in office opposed them and on the other Mahatmji's inflexbility made their efforts useless. Assuming, but not admitting, that their opposition to Non-co-operation in general and to Civil Disobedience in special was sound they should have foreseen that measures like the Criminal Law Amendment Act, the Seditious Meetings Act and the Press Act are the very denial of the rights of free speech, free press and free association. Experience has quite amply proved that legislative powers taken for special occasions and for emergencies have always been used by the Governments for purposes other than those for which they were taken. Governments have a knack of forgetting their pledges and promises when it suits their purpose. Firstly, the persons change, secondly, the circum-

stances. A law is law and so long as it is on the statute book no one can rasonably blame a government for using it, for purposes other than for which it was enacted, if the letter of the law gives them the right to do so. The late Mr. Gokhale voted for the Press Act under certain promises given by the Government as to its use but the Government used it for other purposes even in the life time of Mr. Gokhale, and in spite of his protest. Similarly the Hon'ble Mr. Burgri, Mr. J. Chaudhuri and Dr. Gour may have signed the Repressive Laws committee report (which recommended the the retention of the Criminal Law Amendment Act and the Seditious Meetings Act on the Statute book) under certain impressions as to the use which the Government was likely to make of them but that does not and cannot prevent the Government from using them as they have done and hurling their signatures in their faces, when they object to their use. These and other facts have confirmed me in the opinion that we were fundamentally right in adopting "progressive Non-violent Non-co-operation" as practically the only cure for our political disease short of an armed rebellion. Violence for political purposes by unarmed people is madness. To talk of violent methods is also in my judgement criminal folly. I do not believe in non-violence as an absolute article of faith to be respected and practised *under all circumstances and in all conditions*, but, I do believe that it will be nothing short of madness to rely on violence or to even think of it under the present conditions of life in India These conditions are not likely to change in the near future, so, we may as well eliminate the idea of violence for political purposes from the range of practical politics. I will not discuss the morality of it here. In short, my faith is still strong in "Non-violent Non-co-operation." I did not agree to it under the belief that it will necessarily lead to violence, or that I desired it to lead to that. I have honestly worked to that end and I am proud to say that my province has practised it under the greatest and the most humiliating provocations. All classes in the Punjab have proved worthy of the faith that was put in them. The most warlike of them, the Sikhs, have given the lead and for that they deserve our best thanks.

So fundamentally my position today is exactly the same as it was in September 1920, at the conclusion of the Special

Congress at Calcutta, but unhappily experience has only confirmed the doubts that I then entertained about the soundness of our programme. The Bardoli resolutions force me to the conclusion that the programme embodied in the resolutions of Mr. Dass or in the amendment of Mr. Pal was perhaps sounder than the one finally adopted. The latter was based on several assumptions which have now proved to be wrong. We were very solemnly told at Calcutta that seventy millions of our Mohamedan countrymen had adopted the programme and by its rejection we would be not only disappointing them but inviting their opposition. The unsoundness of that assumption was twice pointed out at the meetings of the Subjects Committee but the enthusiasm of our Mohamedan fellow-workers and the supreme influence of Mahatma Gandhi carried everything before it. Experience has shown that assumption was unjustified. The greater majority of educated Muslims have kept aloof, though those who started have worked for it with all their might. In the Punjab where the Muslims are in the majority and in the North-West Frontier Province where they are 90 per cent, the movement has failed to enlist the co-operation of even a small fraction of educated Muslims. The vast bulk of them feel deeply for the Khilafat, they are prepared to undergo a certain amount of suffering for it; they may give their money for it but they are not prepared for all that non-violent non-co-operation involves. The appeals for the Tilak Swaraj Fund and the Congress did not evoke much response from the Punjabee Muslims, neither did those for the membership of the Khilafat, but the appeals for Khilafat and Angora funds have met with hearty responses. What is the moral? Not that the Hindus should not work for the Khilafat; nor that we should not work for Hindu-Muslim unity, but the assumption upon which Mahatma Gandhi insisted on his own programme of non-co-operation being accepted, was unjustifiable, and that political consciousness among the Muslims is not up to the mark. We will have to work for it patiently and with a great deal of forbearance and tolerance.

The second blunder was to fix a period of twelve months for the completion of the programme. The Calcutta Congress

did not commit itself to this in the resolution, but Mahtama Gandhi and the Ali Brothers did in their speeches. In an unfortunate moment it was embodied in the resolution of the Nagpur Congress and emphasised later on, on almost all occasions. The laywers were to suspend their practice for one year, the students were to leave their schools for one year and the whole programme was to be put through with clock like regularity within one year. Now this was not done to stimulate progress, as Mahatmaji denies that, and he is the very soul of honour. He believed that he would succeed in completing the programme within one year and in bringing the Government to its knees. This was a huge miscalculation, if it meant the creating of such a non-violent atmosphere as is contemplated by the Bardoli resolutions. The last twelve months or rather fourteen months have been a remarkable period of achievement. The country, the Congress and Mahatmaji may well be proud of it. I am glad to have lived to take part in it and to see the happenings of the last three months. They have filled me with hope and pride and Mahatmaji might well have come out successful, if he had not pitched his ideal of non-violence so high as to make it impossible of achievement. Seen in this light it is well that the great army of students in the schools and colleges did not leave their schools and colleges in response to our appeals. Had they done so, the success from the point of view of Non-violence would have been even less. As matters stand the country has been deeply affected by Mahatmaji's desire for non-violence and the columns of *Young India*, and other papers bear ample testimony to the same. We have been defeated not because the country did not rise equal to the occasion but because Mahatmaji pitched his standard too high for the possibility of achievement. I have no doubt in my mind that it is impossible, and if Mahatmaji believed in its being reached within one year he was labouring under a great delusion. I will not speak for others but what I aimed at was this : (*a*) that we will neither use nor encourage violence, (*b*) that we will do everything possible to eliminate chances of violence, (*c*) and that we will by all means at our disposal discountenance violence. I have never believed and do not believe that it is possible to eliminate all chances of violence from human affairs ; much

less from a political struggle of such magnitude as we are engaged in, and against such odds. However we may deplore tragedies like the one enacted at Gorakhpur, we cannot eliminate them from human calculations. The Gorakhpur tragedy was brutally inhuman but it was nothing compared with the brutalities of which the civilized governments of the world were guilty during the last war, and in which they indulge almost daily in some part of the world or the other. The governments do it deliberately, with purpose and design and glorify in it. The mobs in all parts of the world do it only under provocation and in passion. To change the hearts of the mobs in such a way as to make it impossible for them to indulge in these brutalities without changing the hearts of the governments that rule over them is an impossibility. When humanity reaches that point it will cease to be human, it will become a body of supermen, of *Devatas*, and it will no longer need the guidance of men of the type of Mahama Gandhi. I will assume that some volunteers did take part in causing the tragedy, but did Mahatmaji expect that the thousands of volunteers enrolled in the different provinces within the last twelve months would have risen so high in self-discipline as to make it impossible for even a few of them to go astray. The forbearance shown by the volunteers and others in the last twelve months is monumented. They have been mercilessly beaten, insulted and humiliated ; their elders, their friends, their relations and their womenfolk have been treated most brutally, yet the great bulk of them have kept their temper in the one hope that *Mahatmaji will carry through his programme of Civil Disobedience and secure Swaraj for them.* Mahatmaji had raised their hopes to the highest pitch in spite of an occasional scepticism from some of us. They placed their implicit faith in him, his word was God's word. Yet they find that because a few of them in the northern corner of U.P. went mad, Mahatmaji has chosen to throw down all of them from the high pedestal to which he had raised them. The mistake of a few have been made the basis of a general denunication of the whole movement. Mahatmaji himself has found us guilty of coercion, intimidation, lack of descipline, lack of faith and lack of organisation. He even finds fault with us for having failed to realise the membership dues for the year 1922,

forgetting that it was under his order that we started what he called : "Defensive Disobedience" and went to jails, in our thousands : it was under his orders that we suspended the constitution and devoted ourselves exclusively to the work of filling the jails. We could not fill the jails and collect subscriptions at one and the same time.

In saying this, I am not expressly objecting to the postponement of the programme of mass Civil Disobedience. What I do object to, however, are the implications of that action and his subsequent explanations. Did Mahatmaji really believe that when he exhorted people to go to jail even to defend the elementary rights of free speech, free press and free association by defying the "laws" and the authorities he was promoting the cause of the 'Peace' and helping in keeping the atmosphere calm ? Did he really believe that all those who had pledged themselves in all good faith and in perfect sincerity to non-violence would be able to keep their temper under all provocations and under all circumstances ? Did he really believe that all the martial people of India who had rallied to his standard in "perfect good faith" had become lambs. I am a very inferior sort of a person and quite unfit to unloosen the latches of Mahatmaji's shoes but I cannot help saying that if Mahatmaji believed in all this and if he still believes that in the course of another twelve months or for the matter of that in another fifty years he will be able to achieve this, he is quite mistaken, and his simplicity may well be envied. Gentlemen, let us not labour under any delusions of the kind. Human nature can certainly be changed but it cannot be changed so rapidly, specially under the circumstances in which we live. A political leader is like a general, and no general can afford to be chicken-hearted. A general can denounce, degrade, even shoot such of his soldiers and subordinates as do not follow his directions and obey his orders, but he has no right to throw down arms and admit his defeat involving the capture of his army by the enemy, simply because a few out of millions have disregarded his wishes. Leaders of political campaign for freedom cannot afford to wear their hearts on their sleeves. Please do not misunderstand me. I consider Mahatmaji to be the bravest of men. I do not charge him with cowardice. I honestly

believe that he is a man who would die at the post of duty rather than desert it. What I am pointing out is this, that such impossible principles are out of place in political campaign. Bardoli resolutions are a proof of his bravery not of his cowardice, but they have conclusively established that there can be no campaign of Civil Disobedience under Mahatma Gandhi's leadership. The items should either be dropped altogether from the programme or if it is to be retained it should be retained with the fullest understanding of its implications.

I do not think you can now reject the Bardoli resolutions. The movement of Civil Disobedience has for the present been killed and it is not in your power to revive it. In my humble opinion we have made several mistakes in the last two months. Firstly, Mahatmaji's speech at the Malaviya Conference was rather tactless. The explanation that he subesquently gave in his letter ! Mr. Sheshgiri Iyer should have been a part of his speech and his these should have been more conciliatory. Taking advantage of the conference and of the general policy in the country against the repressive laws, he should have postponed Civil Disobedience for a longer period than he did. Then his final ultimatum to the Government was couched in language which left much room for improvement. From that ultimatum to Bardoli resolution is a climb down which is staggering. The fact is that no single man however able, high-minded, noble, wise and sagacious can lead a movement of this nature without making mistakes. Mahatmaji's over-confidence in his judgement and his impulsiveness has often landed us, his humble colleagues, in very false positions but now we are simply routed, and the only thing for us to do is to be happy in our prison cells in the consciousness that at least we have not contributed to the collapse of the movement, and that at any rate, we can expiate our sins of omission and commission better here than outside.

In the meantime poor India is between two mill-stones—one is that of false opportunism, and the other that of impossible non-violence. Before I close the letter I want to say that our neglect to keep foreign countries informed of what was

going on in India has also been almost criminal and it is time that we should undo that mistake. No foreign country can give us any kind of substantial help, yet to ignore them altogether is very harmful to our cause.

To Mahatmaji, I want to say one word. Please forgive me if I have misjudged you, but a sense of duty has compelled me to disgorge my mind. It has done me good. My love and respect foı you is unabated but my faith in your political leadership has received a rude shock. I hope I am mistaken but any way, accept me as I am impulsive, sinful, angry, may be hasty but certainly not insincere.

P.S. Nothing in the foregoing implies that in my judgement the country is ready for mass Civil Disobedience or that we ought not to confirm the Bardoli resolution about that. I have simply discussed the point to express that Mahatma Gandhi's ideal of non-violence is impossible from the practical point of view. As to the actual programme to be followed, just now I am not in a position to give any definite opinion.

Offering oneself for arrest should not be stopped. If Government still continues making arrests, then it will be punishment and will demoralise people.

MODERATES AND CONGRESSMEN

So far I have tried to discuss our ideal of democracy from the indications of it given in the Congress programme. I am now going to consider what sort of government we desire for India and how we propose to form it. There are many among our moderate countrymen who probably agree with us in our ideal of democracy, though there is a kind of fundamental difference between them and us as to the means to be adopted to approach or achieve that ideal. For example, they want to remove the untouchability of the untouchables almost in the same spirit in which the foreign Christian missionary wants to do so. For them it is question of social reform. They will not make it an item and a necessary item of their political propaganda. Their way of doing it is by appealing to the sense of

philanthropy of the higher castes and the richer men among their countrymen. They always think and talk of elevating them. I confess that most of the Congressmen, too, do not fully realize the importance of the question, nor develop the necessary spirit, but to my judgment the timidity of the former is greater than the ignorance or lack of understanding of the latter.

Similarly on the labour question, they are in favour of organising labour and are doing valuable work in that line, but here again they are afraid of the true principles that underlie the same. Believers still in the Manchester School of Economics, putting their faith in the industrial methods of the West, they believe in providing legislative protection for labour almost on the same lines on which it has been done in the West. It is like creating a disease and then setting to curve it by symbolic treatment. I have so far not seen one valuable thought emerging out of them to show how they propose to prevent the problem becoming as serious in India as it has become in Europe. They have not told us how they would cut it at the roots. A remedial factory law, shorter hours, better sanitations, more light, good creches, efficient inspection and compensation for injuries are very good in their own way, but they are like the symbolic treatment of the average medical man. They have never told us how they would tackle the problem if they had full power to solve it in their own way. What are their economic ideals ? Some of them or rather most of them, including the best of them, gibe at Socialism without telling us how they would save India from industrialism. In fact, we are not sure if they see any evil in industriailm of the kind Europe has evolved. They are constantly talking of the industrial progress of their country, as if they were dying for the appearing of Manchesters, Liverpools and Birminghams in India. Do we really want the prototypes of these cities in India or what they stand for ? Do they constitute the glory of England ? I have seen all of them, and I have always wished that we may not have them. To raise the Labour problem, and then try to solve it is hardly the way to do it. To apothesize Capitalism to save us from its evil effects is hardly wisdom. To introduce and develop industria-

lism and then to build up a Labour party does not appeal to me. It may be that under the present system of government that is the only way ! But, then, why not make a serious attempt to do away with the present form of government. A man cannot call himself 'democratic' and also stand for 'safety first' for this government. Therein comes the fundamental difference between the Moderates and the Congressmen. Their ideals of democracy may include the uplifting of the untouchables and the relief of labour, but that is neither democracy nor the democratic method.

The same lack of principles or the same difference in principles distinguished their political programme. They want reforms ; we want a National State. They want reforms up, we want building up from below. They are after gifts and concessions, we claim what is ours. They want a constitution to be framed for them by the British Legislature, we desire freedom to do it ourselves. They want to "reform a Government imposed from without by force. We want to make a Government of our own, which would be a natural outcome, if not a full development, of our ideals of democracy. We want a Government of the people to be built up and constituted by the people ; they are trying to get a Government of the people, not by the mandate or the help or the demand of the people, but by the benevolence of the British. But do they want a Government of the people ? Perhaps in the last resort. At present what they are helping to form, is a combined Government of the foreign Imperialist and the Indian Capitalist—a hybrid which satisfies neither and ignores the people. All their lives they have been cursing the foreign bureaucracy in order to replace it by themselves. At last they have ended by compromising with it and by merging themselves in it. This was inevitable. Their immediate ideals and their methods could only lead them there. To quote a writer speaking of the reformers in the United States (which is already a democracy of the kind our moderate countrymen desire), their methods were three : Change in the form of government (Charters, etc.), the maintenance of 'good' men in office and exhortation to induce the 'people' to elect them." "The idea of 'good' men in office," continues the same author,

"was the panacea of many reform associations. They thought that their job was to find three or four 'good' men and then once a year to hypnotize the electorate to 'do their duty', and put the men into office, and then all would go well, what a futile and childish idea which leaves out of account the whole body of citizenship The widespread fallacy that good officials made a good city is one which lies at the root of much of our thinking, and insidiously works to ruin our best plans, our most serious efforts. This extraordinary belief in officials, this faith in the panacea of a change of charters, must go ; if our present mechanical Government is to turn into a living, breathing, pulsing life, it must be composed of an entire citizenship educated and responsible."

We also have had 'good' men in office both at White Hall and at Delhi, Calcutta and Bombay. We have had a Morley and a Crew at White Hall ; a Hardinge and a Reading at Delhi ; a Charmichael and a Ronaldshay at Calcutta, a Sydenham and a Willingdon at Bombay. When the Liberals of Great Britain came into power in 1906, with a childish faith in 'good' men, I, on behalf of the Lahore Indian Association cabled to Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman to appoint John Morley to the India Office, little knowing that within a year of his taking office, that 'good' man would deport me to Burma without even the semblance of trial, and that within five years he would have laws put on the Statute Book which would cut at the root of the few liberties we had before that 'good' man came into office. (The two Repressive Acts under which I am now in jail, were enacted when he was in office).

But some one might say, all these 'good' men were British. The Moderates agitated for an Indian agency. Very well, substitute 'Indians' for men in the above quotation and you have the present situation. Can any one doubt that almost all the Indians appointed as Councillors and Ministers under the reformed regime are 'good' men ? On the whole, the country could not have placed better men into office. What have they done ? The question may better be left unanswered. My present belief is that even if the British Parliament had granted us full 'self-government', we would not have done much better.

What matters much is not the thing granted but how we get it. I have always believed (and proclaimed my belief from house-tops) that self-government is not a thing to be gifted or granted. If so gifted or granted, it will not be of much value, and we might not be able to retain it, and it is a pleasure to find my idea supported by the latest thought on political theory. Says Mrs. Follet : "It is impossible to give self-government ; no one has the right to give it, no one has the power to give it. Self-government must always be grown ; sovereignty is always a psychological process."

The old Congress did virtually nothing to create a new psychology for themselves and then to change that of the people. In fact, the point of view of the leaders themselves did not indicate any real change in their mentality. They always appealed to the British Cabinet. They addressed themselves to the Government, the rulers. The people had virtually no place in their programme. Is it any wonder, then, that the best of them are still obsessed by a 'slave mentality'? It is not a reproach. It is a fact. They could not give to the people what they did not possess themselves. They could not get rid of the slave mentality unless they changed the process of their thinking. When they say they are not fit for self-government, they speak the truth. When they say the people of India are not fit for self-government they speak only a half-truth. I believe that there is no nation on the earth which is not fit for some sort of self-government.

Fitness for democratic self-government is not acquired by the methods which our moderate leaders want to apply. Fitness for democratic self-government is only developed by the methods which the new Congress wants to enforce. I call it new in comparison with the Congress of pre-1919 days. To be frank, I am not at all sorry, that 'full self-government' was not given by the Act of 1919. If it had been so granted, we could not have the intense propaganda of 1920 22. Of course, it could not have been so given. I am not even sorry that we did not succeed in getting Swaraj by the end of 1921, because if so we could not have the experience of 1922, which was essential for the development of our nationhood on proper

lines. Personally I am in no hurry, as I firmly believe that the path we are treading is the right path and that self-government or Swaraj is a psychological process. Everything we are doing, every suffering we are subjected to, every act of repression and suppression helps. What I want is a genuine article and not a spurious or a counterfeit one. Looked at in this light, we are even grateful to our moderate friends for what they have made us go through.

I personally have implicit faith in my ideals and in the general policy we are following to attain those ideals. There will be periods of reaction and sometimes stagnation. There will be what apparently will look repulses and defeats. Enthusiasm may be followed by indifference, intense activity by comparative lethargy, hope by disappointment. But if the idea and the process, the thought and the method, the ideal and the means to achieve it, are laid down on true lines, they will in time fructify. There is no reason for despondency ; there is no room for disappointment. Onward ! Soldiers of Democracy, victory is assuredly yours. It may come soon, it may come late, ripen your thoughts, strengthen your beliefs, invigorate your faith ; give it to others, take it from others ; integrate your differences and create a collective purpose, a collective mind and a collective will and you will win.

THE IMMEDIATE NEED FOR SWARAJ

It is all very well to lay down ideals and principles ; the real question comes when you begin to apply them to the actual conditions of life. Have we a clean slate to write upon ? Can we begin direct and at once with a truly democratic state *i.e.*, a democracy in the sense we attach to it ? Of course, no. The people have to be educated into it and it has to grow. From the very nature of our principles and beliefs, it is impossible to manufacture democracy, at our call. What then should we do in the meantime ? Should we acquiesce in the continuance of this autocratic, militaristic, bureaucratic regime, as the Sydenhams and O'Dwyers maintain, until our masses grow into democracy and become fit to enforce their will in the state ; or should we accept 'Self-government' by driblets and instalments as Montagus propose to 'give us' ? Is there not force in the

contention that once the capitalists and the bourgeoisie (or, say the capitalists, the landlords and middle classes) capture power, it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the masses consisting of the ordinary ryot, the labourer, the small peasant-proprietor and the untouchables, to come into their own ? Shall the Government of an Indian bureaucracy be more efficient, liberal and progressive than that of the present bureaucracy of British officials ? Will not the Indian capitalist and landlord use his freshly acquired powers to keep down the ryot, the small proprietor, the labourer and the untouchable ? Do not the former elements already predominate in the present legislatures ?

I am afraid it is impossible to give a positively negative answer to these questions. Why, then, should we be after paralyzing the present administration ? Why not accept the Moderates' position and join hands with them in working the reforms ? Because, we believe that the continuance of the present system of government and any delay in claiming immediate Swaraj, is likely to deepen, the slave psychology we have come to be possessed of. Because we believe that once a people on the way to nationhood become conscious of their degraded political position, any further acquiescence by them in the continuance of it is impossible. Foreign rule saps the moral foundation of the subject people. It unfits them for thinking independently, it destroys their self-respect and their power of initiative ; it prevents them from expressing themselves freely ; it bars all kinds of effective organization, and fosters habits of dependence. An administration may be thoroughly efficient, absolutely impartial and perfectly just (which the present British administration by no means is), but it may yet be immoral and preventive of a healthy growth of democracy. A nation can afford to have for a time an efficient administration, but a servile state is fatal to healthy growth of life. Organized and legalized anarchy is worse than an unorganized and a spasmodic one. Dyarchy is only another name for absolutism. It is the same bitter pill coated with sugar. As long as the source of power is situated at Whitehall, as long as the 'steel frame' must be supplied by Great Britain, not by the free choice of the people of the country, but under compulsion, as long as the control of the purse and the control of the

military is vested in the foreign Secretary of State, so long there can be not even a beginning of the democratic process. We may need friendly guidance, we may welcome friendly advice, but as long as we are ordered from Whitehall, it is impossible for us to feel that we have the freedom to grow to our full stature by our own initiate and on our own model. We must feel that the Government is subject to our will, even though it may, after all, be only a class Government.

An Indian bureaucracy or an Indian legislature composed of the landlord, the capitalist and the middle classes, cannot altogether brush aside the wishes of the people as the present administration does. It cannot entirely ignore or defy them. It must consult their wishes and be conciliatory. We want our masses to grow in manliness, in frankness, and in power, not by the methods which the bureaucracy is teaching them, not by learning the alphabets of diplomacy with which they are being vaccinated, but by intelligent self-assertion and by growing consciousness of their ability to enforce their righteous will. We are not at all confident that an Indian bureaucracy will be more efficient, or more impartial or more conscientious than the present British bureaucracy is, but we are confident that while no amount of public opinion can bend the latter, the former will have to bend. No Indian bureaucracy would have dared to pass a Rowlatt Act or to write the report of the majority of the Hunter Committee ; or to decide the Punjab affair as the British Cabinet did. No Indian bureaucracy would have committed the blunders of the Guru-ka-Bagh affair. No Indian bureaucracy would have dared to use force to disperse peaceful volunteers as was done last year. No Government can conduct its affairs without officials. A bureaucracy like the present is distinguished from an ordinary body of officials by its exclusiveness, by its caste-like organization, and by its extraordinary ideas of prestige. There are permanent officials in Great Britain and in the United States, but you cannot call them a bureaucracy. They do not possess the characteristics of a bureaucracy. Officials of the Government, they are also members of the Nation. The prestige of the people is of greater importance to them than that of themselves or the State. They are servants of the people, not their

masters. A bureaucrat is a master, a ruler, a Hakim. An official is an Ahalkar, or an Amaldar. As soon as India becomes self-governed, though not fully democratic, the Indian official, however high may be his rank, will know his position. He will be a member of the Nation first and a servant of the State next. An Indian official, however, who is a member of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy, occupies an entirely different, and a very superior position, superior from the point of view of his prestige against and power over the people. No amount of Indian public opinion affects his conduct.

He is at times even more arrogant and haughty than his British compeer. He is afraid of losing caste with the latter and of falling in his estimation and regard. He is also afraid of his promotion and prospects being affected by the least suspicion or partiality for his country and its people on the part of his British superiors. He can never free his mind from the fear of confidential and secret reports and consultations among the latter. To him the approval of his brother Anglo-Indian bureaucrat, even though of inferior or equal status, often matters more than the disapproval of the whole Indian Nation. His position is extremely unnatural and unfortunate.

It follows, therefore, that the Indianization of the Services will not make much difference to the nation as long as their enrolment and control and their promotion and preferment is vested in British hands. What the Nation wants is the power to appoint and dismiss its servants and not merely a change in the personnel of the Services. For a long time to come we may continue to employ British experts in the various departments of our Government. We have (at least, we ought to have) no prejudice against the British as such. What we object to is his mastery over us. As a friend, as a comrade, as an ally, even as guide and adviser we may value his co-operation, but we donot want his *hakumat*. We shall no longer be his subjects. This in short is my position as regards the bureaucracy.

As regards the other point, viz., our having Legislatures dominated by the '*bourgeoisie*' (the middle classes) I am afraid

we cannot defer "self-government" to the day when a fullfledged and a perfect democracy may be possible, though we want a full recognition of the right of all classes and sections of the nation (including the ryot, the small proprietor, the labourer, and the untouchables to form the Government of the country and to a place therein. In their present condition of mental and moral growth their economic dependence on the wealthy and the middle classes, a Legislature mainly composed of the latter is inevitable. In India, we cannot, by one leap, do better than what nations having universal suffrage are doing in Europe and America.

That does not imply that we can ignore the existence and interests of this class and ride rough-shod over their sentiments and needs. Once we are free agents in our house, we can not only devise means and methods to prevent that class hatred and class war that disfigures Europe today but also to protect the interests of the transitional period. Besides having champions of their cause and advocates of their interests from among the bourgeois leaders, they must be respresented by men of their own class both in the legislatures and in the Local and Municipal bodies. No one is good enough for ruling others and for looking after their interest. The labourer and the ryot must not feel that he owes the protection and the looking after of his interests in the governing bodies of the country to the kindness and benevolence of his masters or employers. Provision will have to be made immediately for the direct representation of this class through its own members in the governing bodies of this country. They will have to be educated by willing friends to participate in the Government of the country.

Just now we have two masters, viz. the foreign capitalist and the Indian capitalist. Surely it will be an improvement to get rid of the former and then educate our people to settle with the latter. We shall have to wait for long if we aim at displacing both simultaneously. By that time we may be thoroughly demoralized and lose even the little self-respect and power of initiative and independent action we still possess.

A CALL TO YOUNG INDIA

One of the biggest evils of an alien rule is the tendency for dependence that it creates in the subject people, which naturally leads to divisions and differences over the distribution of crumbs, which fall from the master's table. When Lord Morely introduced his reforms in 1909 he planned to crush the advanced nationalists by taking the moderates under his wings. He gave a few posts to the latter, and gave a few others the opportunity of prefixing "honourable" to their names. Now Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford are playing the same game. Be it said to their credit, however, that they are doing it in a more masterly way than Lord Morley ever did. Morley was lacking in courage. Having been a theorist all his life he knew how to write, but had not the courage to put his principles into practice. Master of words, he was not quite a success as a doer of deeds. His statemanship, if one may call it such, was devoid of faith as well as of imagination. Montagu, however, is, in certain respects, rising to the heights of statesmanship. But even then he has to go slow and haltingly. He cannot defy vested interests, ignore the junker element in Parliament and the country. Yet, in twelve months he has done more in the way of rallying the moderates than Morley did in five years. He has been giving appointment after appointment to the moderates and has completely won them over to his side. Perhaps the War created the occasion. Besides, he has the support of the Viceroy as well as the advantage of the world changes in his favour. Yet, making due allowance for these, one cannot but put him above Morley in his attempt to effect far-reaching reforms in the administration of India. This, however, is only by the way.

We had started by commenting on the fight for crumbs, which is the natural result of an alien rule. We find it fully illustrated in the present political struggle that is proceeding in India. In Lord Morley's time the Indian Nationalists were divided into two classes, the so-called Moderates and the so-called Extremists. Now it is said that there are four—Moderates and Ultra-Moderates, Extremists and Ultra-Extremists. We have been carefully studying the pronouncements of

all and anxiously watching the developments. The splits and differences and recrimination do not frighten us. In fact, they add to our spirits. Heat indicates life. Friction is not "always" bad. Peace at any price is not always good. "Life is the real thing and not peace and quiet." We have been taught to love peace and quiet more than life, and that has brought about our downfall. The differences in the Nationalist camp indicate active thought, active life and struggle. We are happy over this indication. But we have to guard against their not being turned to destructive ends.

What makes us feel sorry is that so much feeling should be injected into matters which ought to be discussed on broad lines. We are more angry with the Moderates for the simple reason that they make such exaggerated claims for patience, experience, sobriety, statesmanship, past services and sacrifices, and yet are the loudest in denunciation and in shedding tears. We have many friends among them whom we revere and love and for whom we have the highest respect. We have absolutely no doubt of their sincerity, honesty and patriotism, but we cannot concede that they have the monopoly of these, or even of wisdom and sagacity. What perplexes us even more is that we cannot see any very radical differences between the respective political aspirations of the various parties. Of cource, differences there are, but are they so material as to justify all the heat and passion that is being introduced into the discussion over the Reform Scheme ? Do they deserve all the froth and form that is being generated on both sides ? Why have the Moderates seceded from the Congress ? Why could they not stay in a minority, even for a year ? The so-called Extremists have been in minority for years.

Reverting to the Reform Scheme, we notice a substantial agreement that the Government Scheme is not satisfactory, and that it lacks essentials. All parties contend that it concedes practically no power to the people in the Central Government, and in that respect is very defective. All insist that it must be modified on certain definite lines, giving almost the same power to the elected representatives of the people in the Central

Government as is conceded in the Provincial Governments. The quarrel is mainly over words and details. One party calls the scheme "unsatisfactory and disappointing." The Moderates object to the use of these words. They do not want a definite period being fixed for the grant of full Home Rule, while the other faction demands it. One party is satisfied with the scheme for the Provincial Governments, the other party demands full autonomy in all the provinces. Moderate legislators, in Bengal and Bombay and the United Provinces have in their official capacities, demanded full autonomy for their respective provinces. The so-called Extremists demand it for all.

The Moderates are afraid lest too much criticism of the scheme might endanger it altogether. The opposition in England has unbalanced them. They forget that what is conceded is not being given as a matter of favour but "because it is impossible to govern India on old lines and because it is a necessity of the times," imposed by the progress of the world and the rapid strides that have taken place in the ideas of men and women about the functions of governments. They are still quoting the old, timeworn maxims about representative government and political democracy. They have not yet awakened to the consciousness that the old political masters are intellectually effete and dead. Their theories have been suppressed by newer ones which are holding the mind of the world in their grip. The world no longer swears by the words of Mill, Morley, Burke and Bryce or others of the old Liberal School. They are interesting landmarks on the highway of human thought, but no more the dispensers of light and the givers of hope. The world has advanced beyond the points covered by their geniuses.

"The Montagu scheme cannot fail, because it is a necessity of the times." But even if it does fail, its failure will be no calamity. Its failure will leave two alternative course open to the masters of India, either to introduce a better and more democratic scheme or to start an active policy of extended repression and suppression. We are not at all afraid of the latter, as there is nothing which gives vigour to a movement

for liberty, as repression and suppression. Liberty delayed takes its vengeance on those who delay it. See Russia, Germany and Turkey. The British are too wise to indulge in that. They will concede as well as repress. There is very little danger, then, of Mr. Montagu's scheme failing altogether. It is a policy of reform and repression. The Extremists again are childish in demanding a time-limit for the grant of full Home Rule, forgetting that the authority which fixes the time can cancel it later on. We shall get it when we deserve it.

Both parties forget that it is not in the nature of governments to concede more than is absolutely necessary to be conceded in the interest of their own safety. In fact, governments give the appearance of concession to what has really been won by the people. Judged in this light, the political leaders of India are fighting over crumbs. To us, sitting at a distance, they seem to be devoid of vision and lacking in firmness of principle. They are afraid of ghosts and what frightens them is not the strength of the Government but their own weakness. They have no faith in themselves. Some of them have been armchair politicians, writing mostly for profit and gain, occasionally giving a tiny fraction of their income in subscriptions ; or practising law and making millions out of the wretched pittances which the vast bulk of their countrymen make, to remove their hunger. They have always felt for the masses and have expressed their feelings in touching, and sincere language, but they have done precious little to share what they possess, or have possessed, with the masses. Between them and the masses there is a gulf which they have never tried to bridge. They live in palaces while the masses have not even huts to live in. Most of them are Sirs or Rai Bahadurs, or Khan Bahadurs. They are proud of these titles. Their champions in the Press always give a string of "Sirs" in support of their political views. Too much authority, blind authority, mere authority, whether that of the Prince or the priest, of the Raja or the Nabob, of the oligarch or the official, or the wealthy and the prosperous is the bane of Indian life ; yet these stalwarts of reform always take shelter behind big names. Their chief argument is to be found in Who's Who, and if the people who are with them are so many Sirs, so many Honourables,

so many Rajas and Nabobs, their argument is conclusive. They are mortaly afraid of saying or doing things which may offend the Government officials. Even in the selection of their officers, in the nominating of their leaders, they do not look to fitness and courage, but seek out the men who are more likely to be acceptable to the authorities. In their management of the Indian National Congress, they have never hesitated to resort to caucus methods, to underhand intrigues to canvassing, to filling meetings with their adherents, and so on. They are well conversant with the so-called election methods of the Western democracies. Yet they get angry when the same methods are used by their rivals. Now that the Congress has fallen into the hands of the other party, they are calling to the Heavens to witness the calamity. They have wrecked the Congress, says the *Leade*. The Congress was "wrecked" the minute the Moderates left it. The Delhi Session has only registered a *fait accompli*. Their opponents they run down as "youngsters," "demagogues," "inexperienced," "rash," "firebrands," and so on. The people they call "mobocracy." Anything disagreeable to them is immoral. Anything distasteful to then is gross stupidity. All the epithets which their erstwhile enemies and their present admires in the Anglo-Indian Press once used against them, they are employing against such of their countrymen as do not follow their lead and will not recognize their authority. In a minority, they desire to rule the majority, even more autocratically than they did when they had a majority.

The Moderate papers are making great fuss over the fact of some of the old and the most respected leaders being on their side. Time after time they recall the names of..... filling columns with stories of their sacrifices. We have nothing but respect for these gentlemen, and admiration for their services. Nor do we deny that whatever they say should be heard with respect and attention. They are among the makers and moulders of Modern India and the country owes them gratitude. But if, after giving them a full and respectful hearing the country thinks differently, it is fully entitled to disregard their advice and go its own way.

A leader is one whose leadership satisfies and is effective, one who is always ahead of those whom he seeks to lead, who is

fearless and courageous and, above all whose disinterestedness is above suspicion. He remains a leader so long as he maintains these qualities. "Once a leader is not always a leader. Leadership in a progressive community changes with the times and circumstances." It does not depend on age or learning ; nor on titles and diplomas. Sometimes it is the duty of a leader to restrain, to check, and to warn, but the task becomes impossible if he allows his own thought to fall behind that of his erstwhile followers. In that case his warnings go unheeded and his attempt to restrain assumes the appearance of tyranny and leads to his fall. A leader who puts his own past services and sacrifices in the forefront of his arguments for a particular course of action puts himself in an awkward and somewhat ridiculous position, especially when his followers find that, comparing his present with the opinions expressed by him in the immediate past, he seems to have gone back on his own utterances, and for reasons not convincing. Then again a leader who begins to boast of his past services and sacrifices invites individous comparison and odious criticism. Judged by the standard of sacrifices, tribulations and sufferings in the cause of the country, the Moderate leaders must appear very poor as compared with those who are leading the Extremists. Is there one man in the whole Moderate party whose sacrifices and sufferings amount to anything at all as compared with those of Bal Gangadhar Tilak, or Arabindo Ghose ? With the loss of Pandit Malaviya, the Moderate camp has lost the last man whose sacrifices could be put to the test of critical analysis, excepting, of course, the Servants of India. The others with their palatial homes, with large bank accounts, with titles before and after their names, with big estates and mills to make their own lives comfortable, and the lives of their children secure and sung can hardly talk of sacrifices. Why the very positions they occupy today they owe to their patriotism. It is ridiculous then, to claim an acceptance of their views on these grounds.

A few years ago the leading organs of the Moderate Party used to say that if anything or any Indian, appeared to be good and acceptable to the *Pioneer*, that thing and that Indian should be shunned, or at least looked upon with

suspicion. They have lived, however, to see their goodselves admired and praised and eulogized not only by the *Pioneer*, but even the *London Times*, the *Englishman* and the *Civil and Military Gazette*. We remember the days when some of these Moderate leaders used to praise the once Sir George Clarke (now Lord Sydenham) to the skies. One of them once wrote that when Sir George speaks the whole country listens with stretched ears and bent heads. (We are not quoting the exact words.) Think of the change that has come in their attitude towards the then Sir George Clarke, the present Lord Sydenham. The truth is that all of us are liable to make mistakes. The Moderate leaders have been guilty of blunders in the past, their prudence, foresight, statesmanship and sobriety notwithstanding. Their blunders have been of both kinds, of commission as well as of omission. They have let opportunities for action and advance slip by for lack of courage and want of pluck, by too much prudence and too much expediency, by too much regard for personal safety, and personal welfare, by want of foresight and forethought, by ignorance of world conditions and world currents. All of us are more or less affected by self-interest. Who among us can boast of being absolutely selfless ? It is no calumny, therefore, to say that even Moderate leaders are and have been affected by personal considerations. There are few among men and women of all countries who are prepared to suffer for their convictions. Most of us are consciously or unconsciously affected in our opinions and judgments by personal, or family, or clannish, or party interests. In India certainly the number of such persons as are prepared to stand by their convictions even in the face of sufferings and death is very limited. If it were not so the Indians would not be where they are now. It is, in our judgment, extremely foolish, therefore, for any one to claim the acceptance of any views because they are held by Sir so and so or Honourable so and so. On the other hand, it is equally foolish to base any argument on false analogies or to indulge in catch words. Facts are facts and they must be faced.

We yield to none in our desire to see our country free, absolutely free. But our conception of freedom perhaps differs

from that of both the Moderates and the Extremists. The Moderates want colonial self-government by steps, and so do the Extremists. They differ on steps. Both are prepared to agree to the overwhelming preponderance of power which the holders of property, the possessors of special privileges would maintain in their respective schemes over those that have nothing but their bodies and souls. Special representation is being claimed for the landlord, the big merchant, the capitalist, the aristocrat as well as for the Mussalman, for the Sikh, for the native Christian, for the domiciled European. These claims are almost all backed up by the Moderate leaders. There are few among them (all honour to those who are) who can freely vote in a way that will displease the big Zamindar, the Taluqdar, and the millowner. The greatest democratic leader of Bengal is always anxious to keep on the side of the big property holders. He is very happy when they call him the tribune of the people. His clarion voice gives utterance to beautiful pharses and thoughts framed in inspiring language, but when the time for lofty action comes he is always on the side of property, and privilege, and power. He has his prototypes in other provinces also. The truth is that the Nationalist leaders are and have been laying too much emphasis on expediency and prudence and what they call tact. They have read Morley's book on compromise and they quote it in season and out of season. Their political thought is old-fashioned and sterile. Everything is bound to become sterile which is hedged round by considerations of excessive prudence and expediency so as to bury the element of truth and nobility in it deep down under the debris of policy. We do not favour being rash nor do we want to be dogmatic, imprudent, or careless. A certain amount of prudence and expediency and compromise are necessary in human affairs. One cannot always act on a truth the moment one begins to see it. But those who do and can so act deserve all honour. In the long run it is they who win. Nothing is so inspiring, so magnetic, so forceful in changing public opinion, and in transforming national character as readiness to suffer for truth, for principle, for right, for justice and for the cause. The moral effect of one such life on the development of a nation is equal to or perhaps exceeds that of one hundred well balanced, sober, prudent, calculating,

compromising Moderates. Moderation is good so long as it does not become stale and sterile, Moderation in conduct is good so long as it is accompanied by an avowal of the truth. But immoderate moderation, or moderation run made is as dangerous to national development and national welfare as avowed overboard extremism. We think the golden mean is reached when people are absolutely frank and truthful in thought and opinion, and in the expression of thought and opinion, but moderate in the application or enforcement of that truth for an orderly progress of humanity. Detestable is demagogy, for the sake of demagogy, imprudence of speech and rashness of deed to court martyrdom or even applause. There is nothing meaner and far more despicable than that. There are some people for whom applause is the breath of life ; whose private life is full of meanness, littleness, jealousy, greed, selfishness and an overwhelming hankering for popularity, but who thunder forth in imitation of Moses, Christ, Buddha, and Govind Singh when they are on the platform. India in transition has both kinds of leaders. Every nation has. Even free nations like England, France, the United States and Japan have plenty of them. Our case becomes more palpable and attracts more attention because we are a subject people and, as such, every one has the presumption to lecture us and to hold up our faults for public exhibition in order to perpetrate or prolong their power over us.. Let us not be down-hearted. It is a necessary phase through which we are passing. We are neither saints nor devils—only human beings subject to all the laws of change and growth.

Our patriotism is sometimes as tainted as that of leaders in free countries. Really speaking, there are no free peoples in the world. The democracies of the United States, Great Britain and France are only democracies in name. The men in power, those who possess property, enjoy privileges, are as tyrannical towards their own common people as they are towards us. Only they fear the former more than they fear us. They never do things for the sake of justice and fair-play. They do things when they are afraid of the consequence of not doing them. So long as they are safe or believe they are safe, they oppress their own people and their own countrymen

almost as much as they do us. They exploit them mercilessly; they make them draw water and hew wood for them. No one need place much faith on their liberal or democratic professions. There are very few who are really liberal, who have the courage of their convictions, who act as they feel. Morleys and Bryces only differ in degree from Curzons and Milners. Do not pin your faith in any of them. At heart the Liberals and Conservatives are the same. The Liberals have killed Liberalism in Great Britain by their hypocritical, time-serving Imperialism and Capitalism.

The people from whom Young India should draw inspiration are those who live or have lived by the sweat of their brow, who are or have been producers, who know or have known what poverty and ignorance and lack of opportunity and subservience to others mean. Even among them there are more talkers and writers who are professionals, who have big bank accounts and who amassed wealth by saying good things and playing on the imagination and fancy of the common people. Even they are not the real people who should inspire us in our struggle. Young India should by Keir Hardies, Lansburys and Smillies.

To our extremist countrymen we beg to submit that in our judgment there is great force in the statement that complete independence will not be to our advantage. As for full Home Rule, so long as the masses do not show almost incontestably that they are with us, it is not likely to be granted, not because of the reasons that our national enemies advance, not for lack of intelligence or character, not because we are divided by cleavages of religion, race, language and culture; not because we have huge illiteracy; not even because we are too poor, but for different reasons. We are poor because others do not let us use what we have. Our illiteracy is no disgrace. Even in our illiteracy we are more sober, more thoughtful, more considerate than the literate millions of American and Europe. We are not lacking in character because we have more of self-control, more of plain honesty, more of simplicity, less of greed and less of the desire to kill others than the Europeans and Americans have. Neither are the cleavages of religion,

race and language any bar to Home Rule in India. They are to be found in other countries which are free. What we lack is firmness to stand by our rights, vigour and determination to resist oppression, tyranny and wrong-doing whether practised by our own countrymen or by foreigners; readiness to suffer for the cause and the country; willingness to stand by what is right and truthful even if we lose the whole world by such a stand. But the chief reason is that we have no power to enforce our demand for Home Rule. The military argument, the argument of the "silver bullets," the argument of industrial strikes and Labour Unions are all lacking. So long as they are lacking, however much we may foam and fret we shall never get Home Rule.

We are neither Moderate nor Extremist, nor even "Revolutionary", in the ordinary sense of the word. In our judgment both the Moderates and the Extremists have so far failed to give the right lead.

The Moderates have taught us ultra-moderate prudence, expediency, over-cautiousness, dread of democracy and an undue respect for authority. Yet the Moderates produced great souls like Gokhale and Malaviya.

Nor have the Extremists been free from the vices of demagogy, conceit and swelling of the head. They have produced great souls, like Arabindo and Tilak, to speak only of the Hindus. The Mussalmans have produced some really good men like the Ali brothers. Jinnah, Hasan Imam and Rasul.

The man, however, who is after our own heart, though we do not always agree with him in politics, is Gandhi.

The Revolutionaries have shown great courage and spirit of sacrifice but they have also taught us lying and deception, double-dealing and duplicity, beside assassination, robbery and dacoity. It is hopeless to expect a country to be great by any of these methods.

What the country needs is a band of leaders pledged to absolute truthfulness, frankness, opennes and, above all, fearlessness and simplicity. We want leaders who will live like the common people, eating the food of the common people, dressing as the common people, sometimes working with their hands for their living and sharing with the common people their thoughts, their anxieties and their troubles. We want leaders who will not make false or equivocal defence whenever the authorities chose to prosecute them. We want leaders who will not be afraid to attack and criticise the men of property, power and privilege among their countrymen as fearlessly and mercilessly as they do the foreign exploiter, who will realize and preach that what they want is real democracy, genuine democracy, and not the mere substitution of the rule of property and privilege in place of the foreign Imperialists and Capitalists. We do not mind if the real thing comes a little late. What we want is genuine gold and not counterfeit coin. We do not want to give our time and energy and life for the benefit of the native exploiter, be he prince or priest. We want to preach the gospel of social democracy.

Now we do not want to be misunderstood. We know that we cannot fly the flag of Socialism. We do not understand Socialism. We have never studied it. We do not go by dogmas and doctrines. We know this much that the present constitution of society is wrong and unjust. It is cruel and barbaric—even more barbaric than it ever was in primitive time, before the dawn of civilization. Civilization has brought misery and hunger, death and disease to the masses of mankind. We do not want to go back to the primitive age. We cannot go back, even if we would. We want an era of equal opportunity and equal justice to all. In our judgment it is the first duty of every government to see :

1. That not a single member of the body politic suffers from lack of clean and nourishing food, from want of sanitary housing and decent clothing.

2. That every child of a mother, whether it be of lawful or unlawful origin (every child is of lawful origin, in so far as he

is the product of natural impulses and absolutely natural forces), shall get not only good food and good clothing, but ample opportunities for education and development on its own lines.

3. That every adult must contribute to the sum total of a nation's living. That every adult must engage himself or herself, in some productive or creative work, whether physical or intellectual.

4. That every member of society gets sufficient leisure to devote himself to the cultivation of the finer side of himself.

5. That no one kills another unless in self-defence or in defence of society.

6. That every one has, according to the need of himself and his family, free access to land, air, water and other natural and artificial products, necessary to make a decent living and lead a decent life.

7. That no one uses another against his or her will, by force or threat.

8. That every one has an equal political status except when by common consent and for common purposes he or she is invested with a higher status for a temporary period.

9. That everyone is entitled to select his or her own habitat and membership in local group, into which he or she likes to gain admittance, provided he or she does not thereby infringe on the liberties or rights of others.

10. That men and women are treated alike with rights and obligations differentiated only by their physical constitutions.

Subject to these principles, if any member of a social group makes more wealth or comes into possessions of it by the sweat of his brow he is welcome to have it and enjoy it if thereby he inflicts no wrong on others, jointly or severally.

These are our principles and we want a body of sincere men to preach them in India.

In our judgment the era of political revolutions is over. It is short-sighted to try to bring about revolutions by assassinations, murders, terrorism or dacoity, only to find that we have substituted one class of masters for another. What we need is none of these methods.

We want a body of Indian politicians to agitate and press the claim that every tiller of the soil gets sufficient land or such tenure as will enable him to earn a decent and comfortable living. The Government has no right to tax a man whose income is not sufficient for the elemental needs of himself and those who are dependent on him. Nor has the landlord any right to squeeze all he can out of starving cultivators, regardless of the fact that what is left is sufficient for him and his family or not. Down with the foolish doctrine of demand and supply. Down with competition. We insist that the Government of India, whether manned by the British or by the Indian, so change the land laws as to secure a sufficient holding to every tiller of the soil on terms which will enable him to live a decent life.

The inauguration of new industries is very good. We want industrial development, but even there we do not want it under canditions which will deny the wage-earner a decent living wage. We insist upon the recognition of the right of every human being to a decent living made out of land or from industries. We maintain that a body politic which does not recognize that duty, is a lawless body existing on the exploitation of human beings. All other needs of a body politic, the need of security from without and from within, the need for public works, for highly paid Government servants, for national pleasures, must be subject to this elementary duty. We want the Indian political leaders to take up that question and to hammer it. It will have its effect on all legislation. It will create a political and economic consciousness among the masses which will, in time, become irresistible. Beside it will be an acid test of the sincerity of those Britishers who say

that they are in India in the interest of and for the good of the masses and who oppose Home Rule because they believe that unless the masses are politically conscious of their rights, their interest can be better looked atfer by the British officials than by their own educated and propertied countrymen.

We are sorry to see well intentioned, apparently honest, intelligent countrymen wasting their breath, time and energy on non-essentials and ignoring essentials. By so doing they distract the public mind and prevent the focussing of public attention on matters which really count.

In all humiliation and earnestness we submit these lines for their consideration and attention, though we can anticipate the reply "unpractical, impossible, inexpedient." To lawyers, landlords, big capitalists, and big officials, well-paid editors, and titled gentlemen a scheme like that must always appear impractical.

But what about the "Servants of India"? Why are they wasting away their lives to bolster up capitalism? Perhaps by force of habit—and for want of anything better to do. Why are they licking the boots of the bureaucracy, why are they cringing before Sirs, Justices, and Rajas? Why, we repeat and pause for a reply.

4

BAL GANGADHAR TILAK

[Respectfully called the 'Lokmanya', Bal Gangadhar Tilak (1856-1920) has a unique place in the history of extremist nationalism in India. Though the central figure of the trio of Lal, Bal, Pal, his role has an importance of its own that informed an English journalist (Valentine Chirol) to wrongly describe him as 'the father of the Indian unrest'. Through his institutions as the New English School, Fergusson College and the Deccan Education Society established in Poona and also through his two papers *Kesari* and *Mahratta* (in Marathi), he infused the spirit of political assertiveness and fiery patriotism among the countrymen. His slogan 'Swaraj is our birth-right and I shall have it' did miracle in sharpening the zest of nationalism. Having a deep knowledge of Hindu scriptures, he sought to sustain the case of Indian nationalism on metaphysical foundations. He organised the people of Maharashtra on the occasions of Shivaji and Ganapati festivals and exhorted them to embrace militant methods of agitation. He discarded the philosophy of moderatism and preached the gospel of extremism, even nihilism as done by the revolutionaries of Russia in 1905. His notes published in his papers were treated as 'rebellious' and for this he was arrested and sentenced for imprisonment. After his release from the Mandalay jail in 1914, he returned to India. But now he was like a changed man. The way of sharp extremism was replaced by the way of active liberalism. He supported the Home Rule Movement of Mrs. Annie Besant. He exercised his influence as a result of which the Congress and the Muslim League came closer and the Lucknow Pact (1916) came into being. He did not appreciate the saintly ways of Gandhiji and when he saw that the number of the

followers of the Mahatma was increasing, he formed a new party (Democratic Party) a little before his death. Against Gandhi's argument of 'non-cooperation', he proposed the way of 'responsive cooperation'. However, as Prof. M R. Palande says, the most perplexing point about Tilak is that "no Indian leader has probably been subjected to such merciless persecution and reckless misrepresentation and maligning by the ruling and retired Anglo-Indian bureaucrats and publicists as was this great patriot whose knowledge, insight and experience led him straight to the fundamental things and who vigorously exposed the insidious but fatal poison of imperialist hypocrisy."]

ON FINANCIAL DECENTRALIZATION*

The resolution which has been entrusted to me is now put upon the Congress programme for the first time It ought to have been there long ago, but the reason seems to be that the attention of the Congress leaders was not directed to this point until after the Provincial budgets were openly discussed in the Legislative Councils, and after the expansion of the Councils. I propose to go briefly into the question and state its exact position now. It is a finance subject and you may probably be expecting from me a speech full of figures and facts. I don't mean, however, to tire your patience by dry figures, but shall confine myself mainly to the question of principles and a brief history of the subject. It is a subject wherein we have to consider the question of the relation between the Imperial and the Local Governments and it differs from other subjects in this, that whereas our Resolutions are generally opposed to the wishes of the Executive, here at least we have the support of the local Governments as against the Government of India. The different Governments are themselves divided on the point and we support those that best represent our interests.

I said that this is a question of the relation of the Imperial and Provincial Governments. The Government of India regards itself as the master of all the Indian revenues and claims for itself the right of controlling the foreign policy, of carrying war

*Speech delivered at the Calcutta Congress (1916).

not only on the frontier, but beyond it, and that too without the previous sanction of the Parliament, of paying pension and exchange compensation allowances, and of spending money on frontier defences while all internal administration is left to local Governments. For this purpose the Government of India must have money and we would willingly grant it, had it not been for the irresponsible way in which it is spent. Now money is also required for internal administration, and according to the system in force before 1870, the Government of India had full control, over the Local, the Provincial and the Imperial revenue and expenditure. If a well was to be sunk in Bombay or a bridge to be built in Calcutta, the sanction of the Government of India was required for the purpose. It was soon found, however, that the system was unworkable, for the L cal Governments always tried to obtain as much money as possible from the Imperial Government, without being in any way responsible for finding out the ways and means to meet the expenditure. Lord Mayo's Government, therefore, first introduced in 1871 what is known as the provincial contract system. It has now been contended on behalf of Government that the contract is no contract in the legal sense of the term, or that it is only a "so-called" contract or an arrangement depending upon the sweet will of the Imperial Government. I shall refer to it later on, but by whatever name we may call it, there can be no doubt that an agreement between the local and the Imperial Governments was entered into at the time—an agreement, which, had it been entered into by private parties, would have been certainly enforced in a court of law. The arrangement was that certain heads of expenditure were to be provincialized and given over completely to the charge of the Local Governments. If there was any saving under those heads, it was to go towards any improvement to be affected therein. It was also settled that so far as those departments were concerned the Local Governments should make no call on the Imperial Government. After an experience of five years it was found that the system worked very well—of course, for the Government of India—and Lord Lytton and Sir John Strachey, though they were not quite favourable to the financial independence of the Local Governments, extended it by provincializing more

heads of expenditure and also this time a few heads of revenue. There were, however, new limitations imposed upon the powers of the Local Governments which was not allowed to incur certain expenditure without the previous sanction of the Government of India. Lord Ripon, as you all know, took a further step in 1882 and 1884. Local Governments were now asked to assign over to the Municipal and local bodies made really representative for the first time, municipal and local revenues in the same way as the Imperial Government has previously assigned the provincial revenues to local Governments. In Lord Lansdowne's time the contracts were again revised and it was distinctly stated that the local Governments were not to regard themselves as exempted from any call upon their revenues by the Imperial Government. In other words, whenever owing to its extravagant expenditure, the Imperial Government found itself embarrassed, it claimed for itself the right of pouncing upon the local Governments leaving the latter to manage their affairs as best as they could with the revenues left to them. In fact, it was supposed to be an arrangement similar to that between the master of a house and the housewife, the husband claiming for himself the right of indulging in all sorts of intemperate habits and then asking the wife to surrender all her savings. It is against this iniquitous claim that we have to raise our protest, and I am glad that in this we have full support of the Lieutenant-Governor of this Province. As Sir A. Mackenzie in reply to the criticism of Sir J. Westland is reported to have said in his Budget speech : 'I must say I deprecate the way in which these quinquennial revisions have too frequently been carried out. The Provincial sheep is summarily thrown on its back, close clipped and shorn of its wool, and turned out to shiver till its fleece grows again. The normal history of a provincial contract is this : The years of screwing and saving and postponement of works, two years of resumed energy of normal scale, and one year of dissipation of balances in the fear that, if not spent, they will be annexed by the Government of India.' In other words, Sir Alexender Mackenzie calls them quinquennial fleecing contracts. We have alse the testimony of Sir A MacDonnel that it has become impossible to carry on the administration of the North-West

Provinces with the revenue placed at the disposal of the North-West Province's Government by the last Provincial Contact. The view of the local Governments is, therefore, as clear as it could be, and we have to support their claims against the Government of India, which setting aside its previous promises, is disposed to regard itself as the master of all Indian revenue and as such possessing the right of requiring the local Governments to surrender the provincialized revenue for Imperial purposes. Briefly stated that Government of India believes that it has the first claims on all Indian revenue without any obligation to administer well the internal affairs of the country, and that the local Governments, instead of complaining, ought to be thankful to the Imperial Government for the small mercies shown to them. Gentlemen, you will all admit that this is a very dangerous position, for the Imperial Government to take and I trust that my friend, Mr. Wacha, who has been deputed by the Presidency Association to give evinence before the Royal Commission on Expenditure in England, will place the whole question before the Commission with his usual force and clearness. The Government of India means to play the part of an insolvent partner in the administration, and it is our duty to prevent it from doing so by all the means in our power. Of course, when we succeed in placing a limitation upon the power of the Government of India, it will be necessary to curtail also the power of the Governments over the provincialized revenues, in some such way as has been done in the case of municipal and local revenues, by allowing a voice to the representatives of the people in controlling the provincial expenditure. However, as this is the first time that we have taken up the subject, we confine ourselves to the main principle involved in the case, and I have no doubt that you will accord your sanction to it in the usual way.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR*

Sir, your continued malicious remarks about me and the journals published by me compel me to write this letter. I do not expect any praise from you, but I once believed *The Times*,

*Published in *The Times of India* (Bombay), dated 30 June, 1887.

under its present editorship, would at least be fair; but your recent articles have more than disappointed me in the matter. The shocking tragedy at Poona which we all deplore may have obscured your judgement. But I have little to do with your motives. What I want to show is that you have entirely misrepresented my position both as a journalist and a private gentleman during the time the plague operations were in force in Poona. I should have attributed this to your ignorance of the language in which the *Kesari* is published, as well as of what was going on in the city at the time, had I not perceived a deliberate intention in your writing, as well as those of "Shackles" and "Justice", to pervert and misrepresent obvious facts at a time when they think they can do greatest mischief by such misrepresentations. Now let me first of all disabuse you of the idea that either the *Mahratta* or the *Kesari* wrote anything during the plague so as to incite the people to break the peace or to have recourse to force The attitude taken up by these papers was briefly this :—(1) That *stringent* measures for the suppression of plague were necessary, and that Government, acting on best advice available, were accordingly determined to carry them out. (2) That opposition to the measures was undesirable, and that the only course advisable was to accept the principles and to represent to Government if any unnecessary harshness was caused in its execution. (3) That the leaders of the people, so far as lay in their power, should try to assist Government by establishing private plague hospitals, segregation camps, and committees for each peth (ward) or lane, to take charge of the property of the segregated person or to go with the searching parties. Take any issue of the *Kesari*, and you will find therein appeals to the leading gentlemen in the city to stand by their posts and assist the Government by doing everything in their power to render the plague measures acceptable to the people. Your correspondent "Shackles" speaks of "vigilance committees"; but I must tell you—and you can find it if you choose—that this is a mistranslation. All that I have urged is the formation of committees for each lane or peth, look after the property of the segregated persons, and even this was to be done with the knowledge and consent of Mr. Rand, the Chairman of the Plague Committee. The phrase "futility of mere clamour" is again misrepresented

by you. Any one who reads the passage in the original will see its meaning clearly. What is meant and said is, that it was no use complaining against the plague measures from outside the town, but that we must form committees and work to help the people. "Do not complain but work" was the advice given, and if that is sedition, then the Anglo-Indian vocabulary must be more comprehensive than the common English. Perhaps your present feelings may prompt you to say that all this was on paper, and that my conduct might have been inconsistent with my words This is rather a delicate matter to handle, as it involves a question regarding personal acts. But, howsoever reluctantly, I think I must, at the risk of being called egoistic, say something as to what I did at the time. I was not satisfied simply with taunting or advising the leaders to organize peth committees. I myself went (with other friends whose work I may once for all here state I do not wish to under rate in any way by stating what I did personally) into a number of peths and tried to establish such committees but found that it was not possible to do so, as most of the leading men had gone out of the town. As regards the Hindu Plague Hospital, I think I can claim a considerable share of the credit of starting and maintaining it in good order. I used to visit it twice a day, going into the different wards and making inquiries about the patients. Then as regards the segregation camp, it was soon found that the persons taken there were greatly inconvenienced by being required to cook their own food, and that though the Plague Committee paid two annas per head per day to the poor, it was not sufficient to purchase a day's provision. Here again, I along with other friend, had to work hard to establish a kitchen where two regular meals were given for two annas to any one in the segregation camp. The loss, which came to about one and a half anna per head per day, was met from subscriptions raised for that purpose. In short, I tried to do all that was possible for me to make the plague measures acceptable to the people, and everything that was done, was done with the knowledge and consent of the Chairman of the Plague Committee. It was only after the plague had well nigh disappeared that I went away to Sinhgarh to take a short rest. Any one in Poona can bear witness to these facts.

Such being my work, I think I am entitled to say that you are doing me sheer injustice by representing that either myself or my paper did anything to excite feelings of disafiection amongst the people. It was my firm conviction that stringent sanitary measures would do considerable good, if they would not stamp out the plague altogether; and I have not only expressed this conviction in the paper, but have done as much as a single citizen of my position could do to practically show how people should help themselves and not blame the Plague Committee for everything. But unlike yourselves I could not shut up my eyes to complaints and grievances, which from personal knowledge I was convinced were real and well-founded. I, along with other friends, was the first to bring them to the notice of the Plague Committee but I regret to say that the Committee, from whatever cause, never took any serious notice of them. I know of a number of cases where persons were wrongly sent to the segregation camp or plague hospital, or their property was wantonly destroyed; and if the papers which I publish, along with others, loudly complained about these grievances, it was because the Plague Committee could not, or would not, redress them. You and your correspondents, I knew, hold the opinion that the complaints were unfounded. But my personal experience is otherwise, and I still hold that the Plague Committee could have executed their task equally well in a far more conciliatory manner. If we could make the segregation camp a little more comfortable by having a kichen therein, the Plague Committee could have certainly done better. This is not, however, the place to go into these details. All that I wish to urge is that it is a sheer mistake to believe that the native papers have excited the feeling of dissatisfaction during the time of the plague. The Press accepted the principle, but complained about the unnecessary harshness in its execution. You are probably aware that the Bombay Government itself anticipated dissatisfaction, scavengers' strikes or riots if plague measures were stringently carried out (*vide* Plague Blue Book), and it so telegraphed to the Secretary of State. If you blame the Native Press now, you must equally blame the Government of Bombay for openly recording their fears in a telegram which is now as much known to the public as anything said in the Native Press. Anglo-Indian journalists like yourselves can, I

know, be hardly induced to take the right view of the question. But still I must state what I honestly believe to be the case, *viz.*, that the unnecessary stringency of the plague measures, and not the writings of the Native Press, are responsible for the feelings of dissatisfaction referred to by you. His Excellency Lord Sandhurst was, indeed, anxious to see that the plague measures were carried on with the least possible annoyance to the people. But His Excellency's wishes were little attended to by the lower executive authorities, and Government, I am sorry to say, did not exercise sufficient control over them.

Here, I think, I must stop. You have, it seems, chosen to follow in the footsteps of the *London Times* in making reckless charges at such a time against individuals, communities, or institutious. In my opinion it is neither fair nor conducive to the ends of justice to take up such a line at the present time. I may, however, in conclusion, say that it is extremely foolish to ignore all the work done by individuals and the good senses and the patience of a community as a whole, simply because a fanatic took it into his head to perpetrate a horrible deed, which, as I have said above, all of us equally deplore. Further discussion must, I think, be reserved for cooler times, when we shall be ready to look at men and things with unjaundiced eyes.—I am, and c.,

B.G. Tilak

Poona, June, 28, 1887.

INQUIRY INTO ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF INDIA*

I have been asked to support the resolution proposed by my friend Mr. G. Subrahmania Iyer, and seconded by Mr. Mudholkar, and I have very little to add to the remarks that have been made by these two gentlemen. In fact, I have taken it upon myself to support this proposition, simply because it is our practice that important resolutions should be supported by speakers from different provinces, and this proposition requires

*Speech delivered at the Lahore Congress (1900) in support of a resolution.

support from a Bombay delegate. I, therefore, shall put the case before you as in a nutshell and not go over the grounds traversed by the previous speakers. What the resolution is, what it intends, what it asks, and whether what we ask for is just or not, are the main points to be considered. My own belief is that calamities and misfortunes are not sent simply to crush us. There is an ulterior purpose, and, if we cannot recognize that purpose in the beginning, we come to know in the end by experience and by continued thinking over it. Something of that kind is the last dire famine, and I do not think that it is without its use. It has done one thing The question of the poverty of India we have been pressing upon the attention of the Government for the last 15 years, and it appears that a famine was necessary to press it home and, I think, we must be grateful to the Almighty for that purpose. This misery has done us one good ; it has placed beyond the pale of discussion the fact that the Indian population is too poor to bear the strain of a single failure of the rains. That fact is patent, and requires no argument to prove it, it has been admitted by the Secretary of the State and the present Viceroy (Lord Curzon). After this the next question is not whether the Indian ryot is poor or not, but what are the means to prevent it I say there are two kinds of treatment. I am not speaking of the curative means but the preventive means. There is the question of the Famine Code. You may improve it and thus may diminish suffering, but this can only be a palliative measure. The question before us is whether we can prevent families altogether, whether it is possible for us to prevent these calamities and devise means by which continuous prosperity can be secured. That is the question before us, and the resolution that I have been asked to support deals with that branch of the main subject. Now what we have to see is : Can we devise means to prevent famine ? Both of us are agreed that we can. So far, there is no difference of opinion. But when we go to investigate the causes of this poverty, opinions are found to differ. One set of thinkers believe that the causes of this poverty ought to be found in indiscretion, want of education and extravagant habits on the part of the ryot. That is the opinion of one set of thinkers. They all lay the blame on the ryot. They say that the Government has done all it could to help the ryot.

The Government has given peace, protects the ryot from the encroachment of the Sowcars and other misfortunes. And if the ryot is still poor it is the latter that is to blame in this matter. That is one view. But the ryot is what he was 40 or 100 years ago, and if his condition is worse to-day it may at best be partially his fault, but you cannot say that it is exclusively his. The other view, therefore, is that howsoever rich a country is and the soil fertile, if the administration is carried on in such a way that you take away from the country a large portion of the produce without returning to it its equivalent in one form or another, in a material form, not in the form of prestige or advice, then, unless you give back to the people in some material form the return for the wealth that you take away from the country, the only natural result of it would be that the country must grow poorer and poorer. That is the view that has been put forward by leaders of the Congress for the last 15 years, and we have now to decide which of these two views is correct. That is the subject of this proposition—which of these two views is correct, whether the view of the Congress leaders or that of the officials. I am not going over the ground traversed by the previous speakers. But I may say even amongst officials there are some that take the Congress view. At any rate, there can be no two opinions that the question is so important and that it should be discussed and officially settled. It is a question that concerns the entire population of India—30 crores of people, and it cannot be allowed to be neglected after the experience of the dire famine through which we passed last year. That is the proposition and that is our request, which we want to urge upon the attention of the Government of India. You may ask why there should be two diametrically opposite views prevailing, one throwing the whole blame on the ryot and the other shifting a large portion of it on to the shoulders of the Government. Some persons think that the Government perversely takes the first view, but I am not one of those who subscribe to this doctrine. I do not think that the Government is perverse. It is the human nature always to attribute the causes of evil not to oneself but to others. It is the old proverb that 'you see a mote in the eyes of others but not a beam in your own.' Some-

thing of that nature is applicable in this case. The same thing is observable also in the physical world You all know elements of astronomy and motions of heavenly bodies. What do we ascribe them to ? We were unwilling to ascribe them to the planet on which we live, we ascribe them to the heavens. The Government of India is acting very much in the same way. The Government does not think that the cause of people's misery lies in itself, but believes it lies somewhere outside. It wants to throw the responsibility upon others. What we want is that the responsibility should be shifted. When a Commission is appointed the evidence in support of each view will be placed before it. We only want an impartial and independent enquiry. That is what is asked for in the resolution. When once both these views are sifted and the evidence in support of each is recorded, and a conclusion is arrived at by an independent commission, I dare say that like the optical illusion that I referred to, this political illusion will come to an end, and both the ryot and the Government will be profited in the end. With these few words, I beg to support the proposition which I hope you will carry unanimously.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIAN MEMBERS ON THE EDUCATION COMMISSION*

The resolution which I have been asked to second is so important and plain that, I think, requires very few words from me to recommend it to your acceptance, especially after the lucid speech of my friend, Mr. Pandit. The resolution asks for the representation of non-official opinion on and before the Commission to be appointed to inquire into the subject of education in all its aspects, ond if a precedent is to be needed to support our request, it will be found in the Education Commission of 1882. The late Mr. Justice Telang was nominated a member of that Commission by Government ; and no better representative of educated India could have been selected. The Commission was presided over by the late Sir W. Hunter whose sympathies with the aspirations of New India are too well-

*Speech delivered at the Calcutta Congress (190.) n support of a resolution.

known to be mentioned by me here. All that we want is that the new Commission should be constituted on the same lines and that non-official views will be allowed to be fully represented before it. The scope of the Education Commission of 1882 was very limited, but the Commission which is now to be appointed will have to go over the whole field of education, as suggested by the Viceroy in the weighty speech of September last. That there are defects in the present system of education is admitted by His Excellency the Viceroy himself, and I shall not take your time by enumerating them in detail. Mistakes and blunders, observes the Viceroy, there have been, and the Commission to be appointed will have to suggest means for rectifying these evils of commission and omission. It is now nearly half a century since it was resolved to give the Western education to the natives of the soil in preference to the Oriental one. Japan adopted the same resolution 25 or 30 years after, and yet any one who will take the trouble to compare the results in Japan and India will be surprised to find that we are so much behind the mark in spite of the fact that our Government is far more civilized, our finances far from flourishing, and our students if not superior to, at least not inferior physically and mentally to the students in Japan. Why should there be such a difference between the results of education in these two Eastern countries, is an important question and so far as I see, I feel no hesitation in attributing it to the system of education followed in India If our educated men go largely after Government service, if they find their faculties stunted by lack of opportunities, if we do not produce men eminent in science and literature, it is because education in India has degraded to the position of a hand-maid of administration. Our schools and colleges are maintained simply to supply the administration with subordinate members of the service. It is hopeless that such a system can produce eminent scientific men of developed character. You might point out to a Bose here or a Paranjpey there, but let me remind you that they are exceptions that prove the rule. Our ancient system of education had the merit at least that it cultivated love for learning and produced men whose intellectual attainments are still the wonder of the world. I for one don't regret we have made a

departure from the Oriental to the Occidental methods of study; all that I ask for is:—"Let it be thorough." The present system of education requires to be widened at the base and crowned with a superstructure which is sadly wanting at present. As remarked by me before, our system of education has sunk to the level of a hand-maid, I would now say, a subordinate hand-maid of education; and we hope that Lord Curzon would signalize his tenure of office by raising this hand-maid to the dignity of a real goddess of learning, which alone can raise India to the status of the civilized nations of the West.

DEPUTATION TO ENGLAND*

It requires very few words from me to commend the resolution, which has been moved by Sir William Wedderburn for your acceptance. I think this is one of the most important resolutions on our programme today, and for this reason, you know very recently the function of the Congress has been to focus the rays of public opinion annually. We accept that definition; but I do not think that by merely accepting the definition we would do our duty in that behalf—in behalf of focusing the public opinion. That phrase of focusing public opinion is taken, so far as I know, from the Science of Heat and Light, and in the domain of Science, we do not focus the rays of heat and light to burn our own hands. We focus them for a purpose, and we have to see what the purpose is in the present case. We focus the rays of public opinion in India annually and go away; that has been the charge against us. I say that we focus the rays of public opinion for a purpose and not merely to bottle them up and that purpose is to direct this focus of rays to illumine the hearts of the bureaucracy that rule in India, to throw a flood of searchlight in their hearts and to make patent to the world the bodies that lurk there. That is one purpose. The second purpose for which we focus public opinion is, as I said, not to burn our hands but, if possible, to

*Speech delivered at the Bombay Congress (1904) in s pport of a resolution.

remove the indifference and prejudice that you find in the English public as regards India. What follows from the definition of this phrase is that the Congress work which has been carried on from this platform this year must be carried on and that agitation must be created in England. Our principal work, our principal purpose and our principal hope to carry out the programme that we prepare here lies not here—but in England. As Sir William Wedderburn said in the Subjects Committee yesterday, we prepare our brief here but the brief has to be carried over to England. It is there that the judges sit, and our advocates must plead our case before the English judges and not before the judges of India. The Government of India is impervious to our cries. It can only be piercing from within (Laughter), and we must try to have sometime or other control over and influence with the machinery which will succeed in piercing through the Government of India and making an opening in it on our side. (Laughter). That is the work that we have before us. We have tried the experiment that is suggested in this resolution twice before, and this is the third time that we are sending our delegates to England, and I trust that this experiment will result in the establishment of a permanent political mission in England. That is what our object ought to be. I know that our distinguished leaders whom I need not mention, will go to England on this occasion even for a month or two, but then their expedition must be followed by another force. The object of this second expedition ought to be, if possible, to try and establish a permanent political mission in England. Some half-a-dozen of us can manage to stay in England and work there throughout the whole year—365 days in the year—and I have strong hopes that within a very short time we will succeed in winning to our side many indifferent Englishmen—that now have no notion of the subject and would, perhaps, be very willing to help us in forming India a living member of the British Empire. Indian Empire is a dead body and a foreign body; if that foreign body is not assimilated with the British Empire, we shall have to perform a surgical operation and take out that foreign body from the living Empire. I hope such a time will not come. We want that body to be assimilited into a political body of the

British Empire. We should have the same rights and privileges as the other members of the British Empire have. India should not be allowed to remain a dead weight and a foreign body ; it would trouble the body politic if it is not assimilated with the system. That is our object—the object is to establish a political mission in England. This idea is not quite imaginary and illusive. When I say "political mission" I do not use the word "Mission" in the same sense in which it is used in the term "Tibet Mission". You have, gentlemen, the idea of the Christian Mission. So many of the Christian Missionaries come to India and what has been their ideal, gentlemen ? Their ideal is to convert you to Christianity (Laughter). It is a far more impracticable ideal than the ideal which you have at heart, namely, to educate the English people and to convert them to our view. Although the ideal of the Christian Missionaries is an impracticable one, yet they work honestly and with perseverance, and therefore, if we work with perseverance and zeal in England for, say, half-a dozen years, I think your cause stands a good chance of being a successful one and will triumph over the difficulties that are in our way. I think, gentlemen, you will eventually succeed with your perseverance, with your enthusiasm and with the force of your character. With these words, I beg to second this resolution, and hope, that you will pass it unanimously.

INDIA'S ECONOMIC PROBLEMS*

The resolution that has been put into my hands refers to three subjects—famine, poverty and land revenue. Well, to speak upon a resolution like that, I think, the time, even supposing the President is kind enough to extend the usual period, is too short, and certainly I am not going to detain you long. The first thing is that the subject has already been thrashed out by abler hands. As regards the poverty of India, you have Mr. Digby's book, and as regards land revenue you have the open letters of Mr. Dutt to Lord Curzon. Those

*Speech delivered at the Kashi Congress (1905) while moving a resolution on Famine, Poverty, Economic Enquiry and Land Revenue.

have been replied to by the Government resolution issued by Lord Curzon in 1902. On that resolution you have an expression of opinion, so far as Bombay and Madras are concerned, from my friends the Honble Mr. Khare and Mr. G. Subrahmanya Iyer. That is the literature on the subject. It would certainly be a waste of time to quote figures from these books and attempt to prove here what has been already proved —that India is poor or that land revenue is excessive. I am not going to do it. But I am going to explain to you the general position so far as this question is concerned. What is the bone of contention ? We have all heard of the Swadeshi movement going on all over the country. Anglo-Indian officials are claiming that they are Swadeshi in this land. So there are others, especially famine and plague ; they are claiming that they are Swadeshis. They want to make India their home ; they want to be claimed amongst you as Swadeshis, and we are trying to boycott them. Now this movement of boycott against famine, plague and poverty, how is that to be carried on ? That is the question, and the answer to that question is given in this resolution. That is how I look upon it. There are two sides to it. The Government of India says. We are not responsible for the poverty of the country : we are not responsible for the occurrence of famine, if God does not send rain. The Government of India says, we cannot help it, if Plague spreads out in spite of the preventive measures adopted by Government. The Government is helpless. So with poverty, famine and plague. We have given you peace, we have given you railways, what more do you want ? We are certainly not responsible for the calamity. That is one side of the question. There is another side of the question. What we maintain is that it is the duty of Government to introduce such a system of administration as would bring prosperity to the country. What we say is that it is not for the people to take any administrative measures to improve the general condition of the whole country ; it is duty of the Government and not of the people. If Government exists it is not merely for securing peace but for securing prosperity to the land. Financial questions, economic questions, are not to be dealt with by individuals. If they are to be dealt with by individuals, what does the Government exist for ? If we get rain

every year, if there is no plague in the country, no diseases, why, I am sure we can well dispense not only with Government but also with medical practitioners. The thing is that it is a clear duty of Government not to grumble at the conditions, they may be climatic or they may be economic, but to find out remedies, so that the whole of the country may enjoy prosperity. That is what the Government has to do. Take the case of England. The soil of England does not produce food enough for the population for three or four months in the year. If the English Government were to say, 'We cannot help, the soil is not productive, it only produces food for four months, you ought to do without food for eight months,' what will people in England say? They will certainly go against the Government of England and will ask the Ministry to resign. If you cannot give food for twelve months you had better resign, and we shall have another Ministry and another Parliament. That is what they will say. Something like that is a question here also. We have a quarrel with the Government of India and that quarrel is : if there is inequality of rain the Government of India ought to adopt some means by which the effect of inequality may be neutralized. If the rainfall is unequal, some means must be devised by which the supply of water may be regulated such as by irrigation and by others. If the wealth that is produced in the country does not remain but is drained away, it is the duty of the Government of India to take steps by which that wealth may not be drained. If, as I said, there is plague in the country, and if it is clearly shown that it is due to poverty and starvation, it is the duty of the Government not to adopt repressive measures but to remove poverty and starvation so that we may be better able to combat plague. These are the duties of the Government of India, and they have been neglecting these duties, and our contention is that the Government of India should be forced to do its duty I may plainly tell you that it is not sedition to force the Government to do it. It is sedition to subvert it. We are asking the Government to do a thing which it is in duty bound to do, and which it is its function to do. We are asking the Government of India to take measures which will secure prosperity to this land. The whole question was placed before Lord Curzon by several able men, and how did he deal with

the situation ? He took no steps to stop the drain. He took no steps to revive the industries, and the only step that he took was to allot more money for irrigation, and he may perhaps ask me to thank him for it. I do not. Of course I must give my reasons for it. And the reason is this : all Indians are willing to work from morning till evening, for twelve or even twenty-four hours in a day. Even if you do that we cannot get sufficient food to maintain ourselves, to keep our body and soul together. It is clearly the duty of Lord Curzon to stop the drain, and also to revive the industries which have been killed by foreign competition. He did not do it. He only took up the question of agricultural improvement, and allotted more money for irrigation. To keep the drain open and at the same time to allot more money for agricultural improvements amounts, in my opinion, to this : that Lord Curzon wants the bleeding to be kept up, and a little tonic to be given to you so that you may be able to bleed the more, more for England and more for Manchester. That is the situation. Spending more money on irrigation and keeping up the wounds and at the same time allowing the drain to go on simply means that he is administering a tonic in order that his countrymen may reap the more benefit by the drain that is already established. That is the reason why I cannot thank Lord Curzon. It was he who said, I think, when the Punjab Alienation Bill was before the Council, that the Government mills grind slowly but grind very small. The administrative measures or the economic policy introduced by the Government of India hundreds of years ago have killed our industries, and that shows how the Government mill works. You don't feel the working, but in hundred years the result is that the whole of the industry of weaving and other industries of the country are all swept away. We have been made an agricultural country. India was certainly not a purely agricultural coantry. The cloths that you get from Manchester were all manufactured here a hundred years ago ; not only we manufactured it but we exported it to other countries. Now what is the economic condition ? All those industries are destroyed. The land is our only resource, and the profits on the land are taken away by the Government in such a way that even that industry is not prosperous. The demand is increasing every year at every revisional survey, and

the reasons given for it are that there are more railways to take away the produce to England and there are more railways and roads and so many channels to send away the produce. Prices are rising, and you are to pay more to Government. That is the thing which is actually advocated by Government, not only advocated by Government but by sympathizers and supporters of Government. That state of things cannot last long. It is impossible in the nature of things that India can be drained away in this way. It cannot last long, and the resolution which I have to propose asks Government to institute an economic enquiry into every village. Of course our facts and figures are before the Government. We ask the Government either to contradict them or to take them as true. If the Government are not doing it, let them have an enquiry of their own, and let them say whether our facts and figures are correct, and if they are correct the measures that we suggest ought to be adopted. That is what the resolution says. The State demand on land is growing, industries are killed and in fact cannot cure the disease.

ON SWADESHI*

I stand on this platform today not to make a speech on the Swadeshi resolution To deliver a speech on Swadeshism in Calcutta is something like carrying coal to Newcastle ! I do not think you want any inspiration of any instruction on this subject. Your leaders like my friend Mr. Surendranath Banerjea and others, have trained you up in Swadeshism to such an extent that we might imitate you for a long time and yet we may not come to your level. I stand here today to decide that some of the ideas which were not originally incorporated in the resolution and which, unfortunately, I had to suggest, by way of amendment, have been accepted ; and we have now unanimously come to the resolution that was read to you by Mr. Ananda Charlu I am glad that you have come to such a solution for one thing, because our Anglo-Indian friends had predicted that the 22nd Congress would probably

*Speech delivered at the Calcutta Congress (1906) in support of a resolution.

be the last Congress ! And that it would meet with a premature death immediately on attaining the age of majority ! That prediction has been falsified ; and falsified under the able, impartial and judicious guidance of our veteran leader, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, whom we have in the chair. Our differences have been squared ; both parties have approached the question in a spirit of conciliation and not half way. Thanks to my friends, both Hindus and Muhammedans, we have come to an amicable settlement on that point. It is a mistake to suppose that the Swadeshi movement is not favoured by Muhammedans. It is a mistake to suppose that it requires sacrifice from poor people. We, the middle-classes, are the greatest offenders in thus respect. The poor Kumbi villagers require not many foreign articles at all,—probably none at all. It is we, the middle-classes, who are the consumers of foreign goods ; and since this Government is not going to stop the drain by imposing a protective duty it becomes imperatively necessary to adopt a measure by which we can do ourselves what the Government is bound to do and what the Government ought to have done long ago. That one point was self-help and another point was determination ; and the third, sacrifice. You will find that all this included in this resolution, joined with the declaration made in the Presidential address that Swadeshism is a forced necessity in India owing to unnatural economic conditions in India, makes up a complete case for you. I thrust that resolution of self-help adopted this year will from the basis of other resolutions of self-help in years to come.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION*

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I am unable to impress you with my feeling and sentiment. I express my gratefulness on my own behalf and that of my friends for the splendid reception accorded to us. This reception is given not to me personally but as a representative of the Marathi nation. This honour is due to the Marathi nation for the services and sympathy towards the Bengali race in their present crisis. The

*Speech delivered at Calcutta in a meeting held under the chairmanship of Babu Motilal Ghose on 7 June, 1906.

chairman has said that times have altered and I add that the situation is unique. India is under a foreign rule and Indians welcomed the change at one time. Then many races were the masters and they had no sympathy and hence the change was welcomed and that was the cause why the English succeeded in establishing an empire in India. Men then thought that the change was for their good. The confusion which characterised native rule was in striking contrast with the constitutional laws of the British Government. The people had much hope in the British Government, but they were much disappointed in their anticipations. They hoped that their arts and industries would be fostered under British rule and they would gain much from their new rulers. But all those hopes had been falsifi.d. The people were now compelled to adopt a new line, namely, to fight against the bureaucracy.

Hundred years ago it was said, and believed by the people, that they were socially inferior to their rulers and as soon as they were socially improved they would obtain liberties and privileges. But subsequent events have shown that this was not based on sound logic. Fifty years ago Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, the greatest statesman of India, thought that Government would grant them rights and privileges when they were properly educated, but that hope is gone. Now it might be said that they we.e not fitted to take part in the administration of the country owing to their defective education. But, I ask, whose fault it is. The Government has been imparting education to make the people and hence the fault is not theirs but of the Government. The Government is imparting an education to make the people fit for some subordinate appointments. Professions have been made that one day the people would be given a share in the administration of the country. This is far from the truth. What did Lord Curzon do? He saw that this education was becoming dangerous and he made the Government control more strict. He passed the Universities Act and thus brought all schools under Government control. Education in future would pin the people to service only and they now want to reform it. In Bombay such an attempt was first made in founding the Fergusson College. In 1880 and in 1884 the Government showed willingness to hand over Government Colleges to the control of the Fergusson College

but now that institution has gone partially into the hands of the Government.

Policy of justice and efficiency was the policy under which the people are now being governed. Bv justice is meant justice not between the rulers and the ruled but that between subjects and subjects ; by efficiency the efficiency of bureaucracy. Assurances had been given which were expressly pronounced impracticable. Even Lord Curzon has declared that the Queen's Proclamation was an impossibility. This was said not by an ordinary Englishman but by a Viceroy. Bureaucracy has developed a policy beyond which they are determined not to go. It is hopeless to expect anything from the rulers. The rulers have developed a system which they are not prepared to alter in spite of the protests of the people.

Protests are of no avail. Mere protest not backed by self-reliance, will not help the people. Days of protests and prayers have gone. Shivaji heard the protests of the people and the *jijia* tax was repealed. Good wishes between master and servant are impossible. It may be possible between equals. The people must show that they are fit for privileges. They must take such departments as finance in their own hands and the rulers will then be bound to give them to the people. That is the key of success. It is impossible to expect that our petitions will be heard unless backed by firm resolution. Do not expect much from a change in government. Three P's—pray, please and protest—will not do unless backed by solid force. Lord to the examples of Ireland, Japan and Russia and follow their methods. You probably have read the speech delivered by Arthur Griffith and we must consider the way as to how to build a nation on Indian soil.

The rulers have now a definite policy and you are asking them to change it. It is only possible that they will have enlightened despotism in place of pure despotism. It is idle to expect much by educating the British public. You will not be able to convince them by more words. The present system of administration is unsuited to this country and we must prove it. Mr. Morley has said that he was unable to overthrow the

bureaucracy. The whole thing rests with the people. We must make our case not by mere words but we must prove it by actual facts. We must show that the country cannot be governed well by the present method. We must convince the Govein-ment of this.

But can this be done ? We must either proceed onward or give up the cause altogether. Do not rely much upon the sympathy of the rulers. Mr. Morely has given a strange illustration of his sympathy in the partition question. Mr. Morley has said that he has full sympathy with the people but he cannot or will not undo partition. An apt illustration of this sympathy will be found in the laws of the land. Punishment of whipping is provided in the Penal Code and there is another law which provides that the sufferer will be sent to hospital for treatment. If you want that sort of sympathy Mr. Morley is ready to give it to you. If you forget your grievances by hearing words of sympathy then the cause is gone. You must make a permanent cause of grievance. Store up the grievances till they are removed. Partition grievance will be the edifice for the regeneration of India. Do not give up this partition grievance for the whole of India is at your back. It is a cornerstone and I envy the people of Bengal for laying this cornerstone.

Shivaji was born at a time when there was darkness and helplessness. I believe that Bengal will produce such a leader at this juncture who will follow the great Maharatta leader not in method but in spirit. This festival shows that Providence has not forsaken us. I hope that God will give us such a leader who would regenerate the country by his self-sacrifice, ardent devotion, disinterested action. We must raise a nation on his soil. Love of nation is one's first duty. Next comes religion and the Government. Our duty to the nation will be the first.

Swadeshi and Swadeshi will be our cry for ever and by this we will grow in spite of the wishes of the rules. Swadeshi and national education are the two methods.

TENETS OF THE NEW PARTY*

Two new words have recently come into existence with regard to our politics, and they are *Moderates* and *Extremists*. These words have a specific relation to time, and they, therefore, will change with time. The Exremists of today will be Moderates tomorrow, just as the Moderates of today were Extremists yesterday. When the National Congress was first started and Mr. Dadabhai's views, which now go for Moderates, were given to the public, he was styled an Extremist, so that you will see that the term Extremist is an expression of progress. We are Extremists today and our sons will call themselves Extremists and us Moderates. Every new party begins as Extremists and ends as Moderates. The sphere of practical politics is not unlimited. We cannot say what will or will not happen 1,000 years hence—perhaps during that long period, the whole of the white race will be swept away in another glacial period. We must, therefore, study the present and work out a programme to meet the present condition.

It is impossible to go into details within the time at my disposal. One thing is granted, *viz.*, that this Government does not suit us. As has been said by an eminent statesman—the government of one country by another can never be a successful, and therefore, a permanent government. There is no difference of opinion about this fundamental proposition between the Old and New schools. One fact is that this alien Government has ruined the country. In the beginning, all of us were taken by surprise. We were almost dazed. We thought that everything that the rulers did was for our good and that this English Government has descended from the clouds to save us from the invasions of Tamerlane and Chengis Khan, and, as they say, not only from foreign invasions but from internecine warfare, or the internal or external invasions, as they call it. We felt happy for a time, but it soon came to light that the peace which was established in this country did this, as Mr. Dadabhai has said in one place—that we were

*Speech delivered at Calcutta on 2 January, 1907.

prevented from going at each other's throats, so that a foreigner might go at the throat of us all. Pax Britannica has been established in this country in order that a foreign Government may exploit the country. That this is the effect of this Pax Britannica is being gradually realised in these days. It was an unhappy circumstance that it was not realized sooner. We believed in the benevolent intentions of the Government, but in politics there is no benevolence. Benevolence is used to sugar-coat the declarations of self-interest and we were in those days deceived by the apparent benevolent intentions under which rampant self-interest was concealed. That was our state then. But soon a change came over us. English education, growing poverty, and better familiarity with our rulers, opened our eyes and leaders ; especially, the venerable leader who presided over the recent Congress was the first to tell us that the drain from the country was ruining it, and if the drain was to continue, there was some great disaster awaiting us. So terribly convinced was he of this that he went over from here to England and spent 25 years of his life in trying to convince the English people of the injustice that is being done to us. He worked very hard. He had conversations and interviews with Secretaries of State, with Members of Parliament—and with what result ?

He has come here at the age of 82 to tell us that he is bitterly disappointed, Mr. Gokhale, I know, is not disappointed. He is a friend of mine and I believe that this is his honest conviction. Mr. Gokhale is not disappointed but is ready to wait another 80 years till he is disappointed like Mr. Dadabhai.

He is young, younger than myself, and I can very well see that disappointment cannot come in a single interview, from interviews which have lasted only for a year or so. If Dadabhai is disappointed, what reason is there that Gokhale shall not, after 20 years ? It is said there is a revival of Liberalism, but how long will it last ? Next year it might be, they are out of power, and are we to wait till there is another revival of Liberalism, and then again if that goes down and a third rivival of Liberalism takes place ; and after all what can a liberal Government do ? I will quote the observation of the father of

the Congress Mr. A.O. Hume. This was made in 1893. Let the Government be Liberal or Conservative, rest sure that they will not yield to you willingly anything. A Liberal Government means that the Government or the members of the Government are imbued with Liberal principles because they want to have the administration of their country conducted on those principles. They are Liberals in England, but I have seen Liberals in England come out to India to get into conservative ways. Many of the Civilian officers from schools and colleges, when they come out are very good Liberals. Coming in contact with Anglo-Indian men or when they marry Anglo-Indian women, they change their views, and by the time they leave India they are Conservatives. This has been the experience all over. So Liberal or Conservative, the point is, is any one prepared to give you those rights and concession which intellectually a philosopher may admit to be fit to be conceded or granted to a subject nation in course of time ? It is intellectual perception. A philoospher and statesman cannot be forced to do it. I laughed when I read the proceedings of the meeting in Calcutta, congratulating people on the appointment of Mr. Morley to the Secretaryship of State for India. Passages were real from Mr. Morley's books. Mr. Morley had said so and so in Mr. Gladstone's Life ; Mr. Morley had said this and had said that ; he was the editor of a certain paper 30 years ago, and he said so and so. I asked myself if it would not have been better that some of the passages from the *Bhagavat Gita* were so quoted. The persons to whom I refer are gentlemen for whom I have the highest respect. But what I say is, that they utterly misunderstood the position or absolutely ignored the distinction between a philosopher and a statesman. A statesman is bound to look to the present circumstances and see what particular concession are absolutely necessary, and what is theoretically true or wrong. He has to take into consideration both the sides. There are the interested Anglo-Indians and the Secretary of State is the head of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy whose mouth-piece he is. Do you mean to say that when the whole bureaucracy, the whole body of Anglo-Indians, are against you, the Secretary of State will set aside the whole bureaucracy and give you rights ? Has he the power ? If he does, will he not be asked to walk away ? So

then it comes to this that the whole British electorate must be converted. So you are going to convert all persons who have a right to vote in England, so as to get the majority on your side, and when this is done and when by that majority the Liberal party is returned to Parliament bent upon doing good to India and it appoints a Secretary of State as good as Mr. Morley, then you hope to get something of the old methods. The new Party has realized this position. The whole electorate of Great Britain must be converted by lectures. You cannot touch their pocket or interest, and that man must be a fool indeed who would sacrifice his own interest on hearing a philosophical lecture. He will say it is a very good lecture ; but I am not going to sacrifice my interest. I will tell you a story. One of my friends who had been lecturing in England delivered a lecture on the grievances of India. A man from the audience came and asked him how many of them there were The lecturer replied 30 crores. The inquirer replied. Then you do not deserve anything. That is the attitude with which an English workman looks at the question. You now depend on the Labour Party. Labourers have their own grievances, but they won't treat you any better. On the contrary, they will treat you worse, because British labourers obtain their livelihood by sending us their goods. This is the real position, This position is gradually recognized. Younger people who have gone to England like Mr. Gokhale are not so disappointed though those who went with him were like Lala Lajpat Rai. I am entering into personalities but I cannot place these facts in an intelligent manner if I do not give the names, although all of them are my friends. This is then the state of things. The New Party perceives that this is futile. To convert the whole electorate of England to your opinion and then to get indirect pressure to bear upon the Members of Parliament, they in their turn to return a Cabinet favourable to India and the Cabinet to Parliament, the Liberal party and the Cabinet to bring pressure on the bureaucracy to yield—we say this is hopeless. You can now understand the difference between the Old and the New Parties. Appeals to the bureaucracy are hopeless. On this point both the New and Old parties are agreed. The Old party believes in appealing to the British nation and we do not. That being our position it

logicaly follows we must have some other method. There is another alternative. We are not going to sit down quiet. We shall have some other method by which to achieve what we want. We are not disappointed, we are not pessimists. It is the hope of achieving the goal by our own efforts that has brought into existence this New Party.

There is no empire lost by a free grant of concession by the rulers to the ruled. History does not record any such event. Empires are lost by luxury, by being too much bureaucratic or over-confident or from other reasons. But an Empire has never come to an end by the rulers conceding power to the ruled.

You got the Queen's Proclamation. But it was obtained without a Congress. They wanted to pacify you as you had grown too turbulent, and you got that Proclamation without Congress and without constitutional agitation. That is a very good and generous declaration indeed. The Queen was very anxious that it should be couched in such terms as would create hopes in you. Now all that anxiety did not proceed from constitutional agitation. It was after 1858 the constitutional agitation began. The result was, the Proclamation remained a dead letter, because you could not get it enforced, the conditions under which it was made having disappeared. A promise was made but you proved too weak to have it enforced. That is the reason why it was not enforced. The bureaucracy got the upper hand and they established a system of administration in which it made it impossible for the Proclamation to be acted up to. Lord Curzon poohpoohed it. Another lawyer said it was unconstitutional because it was not passed by the Parliament. His name was Sir James Stephen. This was at the time of the Ilbert Bill. They want now to explain away that Proclamation Is Mr. Morley going to fulfil it ? The explanation of the Proclamation is not the question. The question is what will compel him to fulfil it. That is the point at issue. I admit that we must ask ; but we must ask with the consciousness that the demand cannot be refused. There is great difference between asking and petitioning. Take the Age of Consent Bill, the Land Tax, the Tenancy Question.

Whenever there was a grievance we used to hold meetings, make petitions, representations, and complaints in the Press; and once the decision of Caesar was known, everything was silent and we accepted it loyally. Such is the experience of the Government and this is what, I believe, they wrote to Mr. Morley relating to the Partition question. They have probably told Mr. Morley that if he remained quiet for a short time, everything would be right. "The present howl is due to a few agitators, and when sufficient time has elapsed the agitation will subside and the Partition will be accepted. We know the people of India better than you do. We have ruled over them and we intend to rule over them, and if our experience is worth anything we advise you not to yield to their clamorous agitation." Mr. Morley's counsellors are Anglo-Indians, they placed this before Mr. Morley. He thinks that such consensus of opinion, administrative experience, it is impossible to override. Philosopher or no philosopher, he thinks that, the administrative duties require it, and he does it as honestly as any other man in the world. This is is then how the matter stands. The new Party wishes to put a stop to this. We have come forward with a scheme which if you accept, shall better enable you to remedy this state of things than the Old School. Your industries are ruined utterly, ruined by foreign rule: your wealth is going out of the country and you are reduced to the lowest level which no human being can occupy. In this state of things, is there any other remedy by which you can help yourself? The remedy is not petitioning but boycott. We say prepare your forces, organise your power, and then go to work so that they cannot refuse you what you demand. A story in *Mahabharata* tells that Sri Krishna was sent to effect a compromise, but the Pandavas and the Kauravas were both organizing their forces to meet the contingency of failure of the compromise This is politics. Are you prepared in this way to fight if your demand is refused? If you are, be sure you will not be refused; but if you are not, nothing can be more certain than that your demand will be refused, and perhaps, for ever. We are not armed, and there is no necessity for arms either. We have a stronger weapon, a political weapon, in boycott. We have perceived one fact, that the whole of this administration, which is carried on by a handful of English-

men, is carried on with our assistance. We are all in subordinate service. This whole Government is carried on with our assistance and they try to keep us in ignorance of our power of co-operation between ourselves by which that which is in our own hands at present can be claimed by us and administered by us. The point is to have the entire control in our hands. I want to have the key of my house, and not merely one stranger turned out of it. Self-Government is our goal; we want a control over our administrative machinery. We don't want to become clerks and remain so. At present, we are clerks and willing instruments of our own oppression in the hands of an alien Government, and that Governmrnt is ruling over us not by its innate strength but by keeping us in ignorance and blindness to the precipation of this fact. Professor Seeley shares this view. Every Englishman knows that they are a mere handful in this country and it is the business of every one of them to befool you in believing that you are weak and they are strong. This is politics. We have been deceived by such policy so long. What the New Party wants you to do is to realise the fact that your future rests entirely in your own hands. If you mean to be free, you can be free; if you do not mean to be free, you will fall and be for ever fallen. So many of you need not like arms; but if you have not the power of active resistance, have you not the power of self-denial and self-abstinence in such a way as not to assist this foreign Government to rule over you? This is boycott and this is what is meant when we say, boycott is a political weapon. We shall not give them assistance to collect revenue and keep peace. We shall not assist them in fighting beyond the frontiers or outside India with Indian blood and money. We shall not assist them in carrying on the administration of justice. We shall have our own courts, and when time comes we shall not pay taxes. Can you do that by your united efforts? If you can, you are free from tomorrow. Some gentlemen who spoke this evening referred to half bread as against the whole bread. I say I want the whole bread and that immediately. But if I cannot get the whole, do not think that I have no patience.

I will take the half they give me and then try for the remainder. This is the line of thought and action in which you must train yourself. We have not raised this cry from a mere impulse. It is a reasoned impulse. Try to understand that reason and try to strengthen that impulse by your logical convictions. I do not ask you to blindly follow us. Think over the whole problem for yourselves. If you accept our advice, we feel sure we can achieve our salvation thereby. This is the advice of the New Party. Perhaps we have not obtained a full recognition of our principles. Old prejudices die very hard. Neither of us wanted to wreck the Congress, so we compromised, and were satisfied that our principles were recognised, and only to a certain extent. That does not mean that we have accepted the whole situation. We may have a step in advance next year, so that within a few years our principles will be recognised, and recognised to such an extent that the generations who come after us may consider us Moderates. This is the way in which a nation progresses. This is the way national sentiment progresses, and this is the lesson you have to learn from the struggle now going on. This is a lesson of progress, a lesson of helping yourself as much as possible, and if you really perceive the force of it, if you are convinced by these arguments, then and then only is it possible for you to effect your salvation from the alien rule under which you labour at this moment.

There are many other points but it is impossible to exhaust them all in an hour's speech. If you carry any wrong impression, come and get your doubts solved. We are prepared to answer every objection, solve every doubt, and prove every statement. We want your co-operation ; without your help we cannot do anything single-handed. We beg of you, we appeal to you, to think over the question, to see the situation, and realise it, and after realising it to come to our assistance, and by our joint assistance to help in the salvation of the country.

PRINCIPLES OF THE NATIONALIST PARTY*

We have not come to cause a split in the Congress, we do not want to hold a separate Congress, we want to see that the

*Speech delivered at a public meeting in Surat on 23 December, 1907.

by the Grand Old Man of India, Sj. Dadabhai Naoroji. This is our ideal and if we do not stick to this resolution—to this ideal of our Grand Old Man, what will he say ? We will be considered traitors to the country. Political regeneration is our goal. No one has any authority to make the Congress recede from this ideal. It will be your sincere duty to see that the name of your city be not associated with this retrograde movement. It would be better if we do not make any progress but we should at least try our best not to recede. In this we want your assistance. It is said by Mr. Morley and by the London *Times* that self-government is impracticable for India. Remember, what is impracticable for Mr. Morley and for the Anglo-Indians is practicable for our countrymen because our interests are conflicting. This our ideal of Swaraj is a distinct goal for the mass to understand. All past ideals are amalgamated into one pure and simple ideal of *Swaraj*, government for the people, by the people.

We do not come here to embarrass the Moderates. We have determined not to allow the Congress to retrograde. By the grace of God, we will succeed I am confident of success, for our cause is a right cause. Whoever he may be, high or low, it will be impossible for him to check the tide of progress. This ideal is our ideal, is the ideal of the younger generation not to damp the spirit of youth. Don't allow them to go far, but don't cripple them. The Moderates are afraid of the word boycott but not of the deed. We feel also as they feel that Swadeshi and boycott had already the effect of vivifying the country. Boycott is the only weapon for the subject nation.

You have heard of the Transvaal Indians. They are not treated as the English King's subjects, but we are asked to be members of the Empire. We don't want to be the slaves of the Empire, we want to be equals or friends with the white subjects not only in India but throughout the whole Empire. The authorities of Transvaal have levied a Jazia-tax on the Indians. 13,000 of our Indians there have met and have determined not to obey the unjust law (hear, hear) while only four hundred form traitors to the country. Do you approve of this attitude of the 13,000 Transvaal Indians ? The Congress does approve

and the Moderates of the Reception Committee are willing to approve this act and they have drafted a resolution to this effect. If you approve this conduct of the far off Indians you approve boycott, for the people there have boycotted the unjust foreign laws. This is not inconsistent. The Moderates don't want to please the Government; if that would have been the case, I would have been very glad ; but no, no, they fear a civilised government. It is unmanly. If you are not prepared to brave the dangers, be quiet, but don't ask us to retrograde. Pray do not come in the way of the ideals which we have received from the last two Congresses. When the people of the country have no voice in the government of this country, boycott is useful. I implore you, you the citizens of Surat, to help us in our endeavours.

Now we have done with *Swaraj* and Boycott. I now come to the third ideal—National Education the resolution which was passed in the last Congress. But the Reception Committee of Surat have not thought it wise to place it among the draft resolutions. It was not allowed in the Provincial Conference held in April here, because certain autocrats did not like this. We don't want to carry this matter high-handedly, as they do ; we will place this before the Subjects Committee and before the Congress delegates. We want to be loyal to the Congress first and in showing our loyalty if our individual interest comes in the way, we will brush this out. It is not a personal question. However high or dignified may one be, respect for him should not come in the way of the Congress. It is a fight for progress. Friction there must be. Where is motion without friction ? And this law holds good in the sphere of politics. We must take care that the friction should not be allowed to go so far as to put a stop to this motion. We have our limits. We want unanimous consent. If not, we will have the resolution passed by the majority and if it is passed, it must be carried. Even the President-elect has no right to change this. A resolution once passed in the Congress must be accepted by all those who join the Congress, whether they like it or not. There will not be any rowdyism there. It is misrepresented. We have come here to fight out constitutionally ; we will loyally fight out ; we will behave as gentlemen even if our opponents do not do so.

Our opponents create rowdyism when they fear defeat. We are fighting against foreign autocracy. Why should we allow this home-autocracy ? So we want to prevent the autocratic rule in the Congress. The Congress is an organization of all the people and the voice of the people ought to predominate. We should not allow any man, high or low, to ruin the cause of the Congress. Don't recede, even if you cannot progress. Our ideal is practicable. We should stick to our ideal. The policy of the Moderates is destructive. It is a suicidal policy. I don't want you to follow it ; we want to progress. Again, I appeal to you. Suratees, Gujaratees, be not led by the threats of the autocrats. Don't fear and we will succeed—*Bande Mataram.*

AFTER BREAK-UP OF CONGRESS AT SURAT*

The bone of contention between the two parties was that some high persons managing the affairs of the Surat Congress were firmly determined to bring down the Congress from the high pedestal which it occupied a year ago into the lower position of an All-India Moderate Congress. That was a retrograde move against which the Nationalists had fought during the past few days. The Surat Reception Committee had brushed aside the claim of Lala Lajpat Rai for the Presidentship on the ground that his election would offend the Government which would throttle the Congress in no time. That was the beginning of the end of the Congress. The dragging of the national movement into a sectional one could not have been accomplished, had not a few individuals been allowed to take the whole power into their own hands and to put forward ideals and methods which fell in with the views of the Government—he did not mean to say that there was a compact between the Government and those individual members. But a creed was enunciated which was least objectionable to the Government. He would not say the most acceptable to the Government, because he did not believe that the Congress creed would ever be acceptable to them. The Nationalists had to devise means to keep up the work of the

*Speech on 28 December, 1907 at a meeting of the delegates of the Nationalist Party at Surat held under the chairmanship of Aurobindo Ghose.

Congress. They must devise measures for keeping up the Congress work, their starting-point being the position taken up at the Calcutta Congress. It might be prudent, in worldly interests, to recede from it, but it was not prudent in the interests of the country. Time had come to exhibit more of the resisting spirit in them than the desire to please the authorities, or to advance as cautiously as it might be possible under the rules and regulations, repressive or otherwise, of the Government of this country. The Nationalists should do what they could do do keep up the fire until the time came when the small light they might be able to preserve might develop into a magnificent blaze. The Nationalists had not met there for the purpose of creating a new organization which would only advance to the limit up to which the Government would allow it to advance, but for creating an organization which would have a life of its own, a life that would enable it to grow under the most distressing and discouraging circumstances, under the most chilling atmosphere of repression.

Ways and Means : How to do it ? was the question. It was necessary, therefore, to appoint a committee of 30 to 50 members, who would watch the effects of the split, and decide upon the measures to be taken to check the evil effects thereof, and, if possible, make arrangements for the meeting of the Congress next year at some place. The committee to be appointed would work, not in a spirit of rivalry with the other party, but in a spirit of co-operation wherever possible, and he hoped that, within a short time, by the grace of Providence, an opportunity would present itself when both the parties would again be united for the purpose, not only of resisting the repressive measures of the Government, but of advancing towards the goal of Self-government unfolded last year.

NATIONAL EDUCATION*

I shall speak here this evening on national education. We are not accustomed to this term, hence it needs a little explana-

*Extracts form the English version of a speech delivered at Barse in Marathi in 1908.

tion. To be able to read and write alone is no education. These are simply the means of its attainment. That which gives us a knowledge of the experiences of our ancestors is called education. It may, however, be through books or through anything else. Every business needs education and every man has thus to give it to his children. There is no business indeed which does not require education. Our industries have been taken away by other people, but we do not know it. A potter knows how to shape a pot of China-clay but does not know what this clay is made of; hence his industry is lost. Similarly is the necessity of religious education. How can a person be proud of his religion if he is ignorant of it? The want of religious education is one of the causes that have brought the missionary influence all over our country. We did not think of it until very lately, whether we get the right sort of education or not. The tradesmen who are present here this evening send their sons very reluctantly to school and some of them do not send at all; because they do not get their education which they need. Besides their, some educated in the present-day system turn out fashionable. They wish to become clerks. They feel ashamed to sit on the *gaddi* where their forefathers earned the whole of their estate. The reason of this is that the education which they receive is one-sided. The Government wanted Engineers, Doctors and clerks. It therefore started such schools which could supply its need. The students therefore who came out of these schools at first were bent upon services. It was the state of things sometime back that after passing three or four classes in school one could easily get on in life, but it has now become absolutely difficult, even to live from hand to mouth. We have therefore become conscious. It has become now almost clear that it is not the fault on our part that even after getting so much education we remain unable to satisfy our bare necessities; but the fault goes direct to the education that we receive. Naturally therefore the question as to how to reform the present system of education stood before us. If the Educational Department had been under our control we could have effected in it any necessary changes immediately. At first we asked the Government to transfer it to our control—the selection of the text-books for schools, for example. We feel now the necessity of

such education which will prepare us to be good citizens. His Excellency the Governor of Bombay also admits the necessity of reforms in the present system of education. But he says that the Government is short of funds. I do not think this excuse reasonable, it may be true or otherwise. It is, however, true that the Government cannot think of this matter. The Government cannot give us religious education : and it is well that they are not doing it ; because they are not our co-religionists. We are not given such education as may inspire patriotic sentiments amongst us. In America the Proclamation of Independence is taught in V or VI classes. In this way they train their children in politics. Some eighty or ninety years ago the industries of Germany declined on account of the rivalry between England and that country. But the German Government at once started scientific and mechanical education in that country. In this way Germany became so powerful in commerce that she has now become an object of dread to other countries Properly speaking these things ought to be done by the Government itself. We pay taxes to the Government only that it may look after our welfare. But the Government wants to keep us lame. There is conflict between the commercial interests of England and India. The Government therefore cannot do anything in this matter.

There being no convenient schools in the villages, our villagers cannot train their children. We must therefore begin this work. There has been a good deal of discussion over this matter. And in the end we have come to the conclusion that for proper education national schools must be started on all sides. There are some of our private schools but owing to the fear of losing the grant-in-aid, the necessary education cannot be given there. We must start our own schools for this education. We must begin our work selflessly. Such efforts are being made all over the country. The Gurukul of Hardwar stands on this footing. Berar and Madras have also begun to move in this direction. Our *Maharashtra* is a little backward. A few efforts are being made here also ; but they need encouragement from you. Money is greatly needed for this work. I am sure, if you realise the necessity and importance of this subject, you would encourage the organisers generously.

So far I have told you about the subject, now I turn to tell you what we shall do in these schools of national education.

Of the many things that we will do there *religious education will first and foremost engage our attention.* Secular education only is not enough to build up character Religious education is necessary because the study of high principles keeps us away from evil pursuits Religion reveals to us the form of the Almighty. Says our religion that a man by virtue of his action can become even a god. When we can become gods even by virtue of our action, why may we not become wise and active by means of our action like the Europeans ? Some say that religion begets quarrel. But I ask, "Where is it written in religion to pick up quarrels ?" If there be any religion in the world which advocates toleration of other religious beliefs and instructs one to stick to one's own religion, it is the religion of the Hindus alone. Hinduism to the Hindus, Islamism to the Musalmans will be taught in these schools. And it will also be taught there to forgive and forget the differences of other religions.

The second thing that we will do, will be to lighten the load of the study of the foreign languages. In spite of a long stay in India no European can speak for a couple of hours fluent Marathi, while our graduates are required as a rule to obtain proficiency in the English language. One who speaks and writes good English is said, in these days, to have been educated. But a mere knowledge of the language is no true education. Such a compulsion for the study of foreign languages does not exist anywhere except in India. We spend twenty or twenty-five years for the education which we can easily obtain in seven or eight years if we get it through the medium of our vernaculars. We cannot help learning English ; but there is no reason why its study should be made compulsory. Under the Mahomedan rule we were required to learn Persian but we were not compelled to study it. To save unnecessary waste of time we have proposed to give education through our own vernaculars.

Industrial education will be the third factor. In no school this education is given. It will be given in these schools. It is an

important thing. During the whole of this century we have not known how a match is prepared. In Sholapur matches are manufactured from straw; and straw is found abundantly in our country. If therefore this industry is taken into our hands the importation of matches will largely decrease in India. It is the same with the sugar industry. We can procure here as good sugarcane as is found in Mauritius. It is seen by scientific experiments that the sugarcane found in the suburbs of Poona can produce as much sugar as is found in the sugarcane of Mauritius. Six crores of rupees are drained out every year from this country only for sugar. Why should this be ? Well, can we not get here sugarcane ? or the machinery necessary for its manufacture ? The reason is that we do not get here the education in this industry. It is not so in Germany. The Department of Industry investigates there as to which industry is decaying, and if perchance there be any, in a decaying state, substantial support at once comes forth from the Government for reviving it. The British Government, too, does the same thing in England. But our Government does not do it here. It may be a mistake or the Government may be doing it knowingly, but it is clear that we must not sit silent if the Government is not doing it. We are intending to start a large mechanical and scientific laboratory for this purpose. Sugar produces *Rab* and form *Rab* is extracted liquor, but the Government does not permit us this extraction : hence the cannot get here cheap sugar. Mauritius imports to this country twenty thousand tons of sugar every year. All this is due to the policy of the Government, but we do not know it. The Government will be obliged to change it if we put pressure upon it. We have come to learn these things not earlier than twenty-five years after leaving the college. Our young men should know them in their prime of life.

Education in politics will be the fourth factor. We are not taught this subject in the Government schools. The student must understand that the Queen's Proclamation is the foundation of our rights. The Government is trying to shut our young men from these things. What has been proved by our revered Grand Old Man—Dadabhoy Naoroji, after a ceaseless exertion for over fifty years, should be understood by our students in

their youth. Every year some thirty or forty crores of rupees are drained out of India without any return. We have, therefore, fallen to a wretched state of poverty. These things, if understood in the prime of life, can make such a lasting impression over the hearts of our young men, as it would be impossible in an advanced age. Therefore, this education should be given in school. Educated men of the type of Prof. Vijapurkar, have come forth to devote their lives in the cause of this education. The educationists are helping with their learning and experience, and it now remains with the well-to-do to help them with money. It is a matter of common benefits, if the furture generation come out good, able to earn their bread and be true citizens. We should have been glad if the Government had done it. If the Government cannot do it, we must do. The Government will not interfere with us and if at all it does so, we should not mind it. As the dawn of the Sun cannot be stopped, so it is with this. Our poverty has not yet reached its zenith. In America such work is done by a single man. But if no one man can venture to do it here, let us do it unitedly, for we are thirty crores of people. A sum of five lacs of rupees goes out every year for liquor alone from Sholapur. Can you not therefore help us in this work ? The will is wanted. Let the Government be displeased—we hope the Government will never deter us—must do our duty. If the Government prohibits us from marriages, do we obey it ? The same is the case with education. As men do not give up building houses for fear that rats would dig holes, so we should not give up our work for fear of Government displeasure. If perchance any difficulty arises our young men are to face it. To fear difficulties is to lose manliness. Difficulties do us immense good. They inspire in us courage and prepare us to bear them manly. A nation cannot progress if it meets no difficulties in the way. We do not get this sort of education for want of self-Government. We should not therefore await the coming of these rights, but we must get up and begin the work.

THE COUNTRY'S MISFORTUNE*

If there is any lesson to be learnt by our rulers from the Muzaffarpore bomb affairs and from the statements of the

*Excerpts from official translation of an article published in the Marathi paper *Kesari* of Tilak dated 12 May, 1908.

young gentlemen implicated in it, it is this along; and we humbly take permission to bring this very thing again and again to their notice. We are aware that our Government will, by assuming a stern aspect (and) by the adoption of harsh measures, be able to stop immediately outrages like the one that occurred at Muzaffarpore. But even if such means be necessary at the present time to maintain peace, still that will not completely remove the root of the disease, and so long as the disease in the body has not been rooted out, no one will be able to guarantee that if a boil in one part (of the body) is cut away, another will not develop again in some other part. It is the King's and the subjects' great misfortune that such times should befall a mild country like India which is naturally loyal and averse to horrible deeds. There is no difference of opinion that those who are responsible for the maintenance of peace in the country should immediately stop outrages of this kind on their coming to light, but the remedies that are to be adopted with a view to prevent the repetition of such horrible calamities should only be adopted with foresight and consideration. It is now plain that not only has the system of Government in India become unpopular but also that the prayer made many times by the people for the reform of that system having been refused, even some educated people forgetting themselves in the heat of indignation have begun to embark upon the perpetration of improper deeds. Men of equable temperament and of reason in the nation will not approve of such violence; nay, there is even a possibility that in consequence of such violence increased oppression will be practised upon the people for some time (to come) instead of its being stopped. But a glance at the recent history of Russia will show that such excesses or acts of violence are not at all stopped by subjecting the people to increased oppression. It is true that in order to acquire political rights efforts are required to be made for several successive generations and those efforts, too, are required to be made peacefully, steadily, persistently and constitutionally! But while such efforts are being made who will guarantee that no person whatever in society will go out of control? And as such guarantee cannot be given how would it be reasonable to say that all persons who put forth efforts for acquiring political rights are seditious?

This is what we do not understand. Just as it is difficult to lay down a restriction that not even a tear or two must fall from the eyes of a man while his heart has become sorely afflicted by sorrow, in the same manner it is vain to expect that the unrestricted method of the administration, under which India is being ruled over in a high-handed and reckless manner, should become only so far unbearable to the people that no one should become unduly exasperated and resort to excesses on that account. It may be said that, with the exception of some few individuals, the educated and uneducated classes in the country are not as yet prepared to transgress lawful or constitutional limits, nay, even such a desire has not risen in their minds. Under such circumstances to throw the responsibility of the horrible Muzzaffarpore affair on that class is adding insult to injury. It can be that these things are not understood by a wise Government of the twentieth century, but the intoxication of unrestricted authority and the earnest desire to benefit one's own countrymen is so extraordinary that event wise men become blind thereby on certain occasions. The calamitous occasion which has fallen Indians at the present time is of this very kind. There is no possibility of the structure of British rule giving way in consequence of the murder of high white officers. If one passes away a second will come in his place, if the second passes away a third will succeed, there is no one whatever so foolish as not to understand this. But Government should take this lesson from the Muzaffarpore affair that the minds of some (person) out of the young generation have begun to turn towards violence on seeing that all peaceful agitation for the acquisition of political rights has failed, just as a deer attacks a hunter, totally regardless of its own life, after all means of protection have been exhaused. No sensible man will approve of this excess or sinful deed. But it is impossible not o ly for the subjects but even for the King to avoid or to totally stop this traga of desecration : and traga really speaking is at all times the result only of a climax of exasperation and despair. True statesmanship, it may be said, consists, indeed in not allowing these things to reach such an extreme or (critical) stage, and this is the very policy we are candidly and plainly suggesting to Government on the present occasion. We do not think that

we have done the whole of our duty as subjects by humbly informing Government that the affair that occurred at Muzaffarpore was horrible and that we vehemently condemn or repudiate it. All heartily desire that such improper things should not take place and that none from among the subjects should have an occasion to resort to such extremes. But at such a time it must also to be necessarily considered how far the ruling official class should, by utterly disregarding this desire of the subjects, try their patience to the uttermost; otherwise it will not be possible to maintain cordial relations between the rulers and the subjects and to carry on smoothly the business of either.

THESE REMEDIES ARE NOT LASTING*

The authorities have spread the false report that bombs of the Bengalis are subversive of society. There is as wide a difference between the bombs in Europe desiring to destroy society and the bombs in Bengal as between the earth and heaven. There is an excess of patriotism at the root of the bombs in Bengal, while the bombs in Europe are the product of the hatred felt for selfish millionaires. The Bengalis are not anarchists but they have brought into use the weapon of the anarchists ; that is all. The anarchist murdering the President in Paris simply because he is the President, is one man ; while the madcap patriot of Portugal throwing a bomb at the King of Portugal because he suppresses the Parliament is different (person). The anarchist who murders a millionaire in America for the only reason that he is a millionaire is one man, while the exasperated Russian patriot who throws a bomb in despair because the Czar's officers do not grant the rights of the Duma in Russia, is different. No one should forget that the bombs in Bengal do not belong to the first category but to the second. The bomb in Portugal effected a change in the system of government in Portugal and the ministry of the new boy-monarch had to abandon the previous repressive policy. The most mighty Czar of Russia, too, had perforce to bow

*Excerpts from official translation of an article published in the Marathi paper *Kesari* of Tilak dated 9 June, 1908.

down before the bomb, and while making repeated attempts to break up the Duma, was at last obliged to establish it as a matter of course. That the bombs came to a stop in Portugal, or, that the series of bombs in Russia did not lengthen will not be set down by any one to the credit of the policy of repression. New desires and new ambitions have risen amongst the people and are gathering strength everyday ; such was the interpretation put upon bombs by the statesmen of both the aforesaid countries ; and accordingly they changed the character of the administration in such a way that the desires and the ambitions of the people should at least be partially gratified and that they should not become utterly desperate and resort to violence. When the Explosives Act was passed in England (about) ten or fifteen years ago, the bomb had not attained such a form of knowledge (as at present). The bomb had not (then) become a mere toy of the Western science. At that time elaborate appliances, too, were required : also special materials were required and the factory also used to be a big one. Such things can be prevented by law ; but when science begins to exhibit wonders like the bomb in mere sport (and even) while walking, talking (and) sleeping, how can these simple sports of science be put a stop to ? The Westerners propitiated the goddess of science for (securing) commercial progress and military strength. How will it do to accept only the gift of the blessing of the propitiated goddess and to refuse only those things which that very goddess may be going in mere sport in order that no one may become intoxicated with the bestowal of the blessings ? While the knowledge of the science of the Westerners is being thus easily obtained (by people) everyday, and while new discoveries are being daily made that produce terrific powers in no time with a simple process from common chemicals themselves which are constantly required for trade and industries, how long will Government stop, by legal restraints, the current of the sport of scientific experts ? In our opinion Government are going to put themselves and the subjects to loss for nothing, by pursuing impossible things. If the perfect state to which scientific knowledge has attained in Europe and America be considered, (one) has to say that Government has been engaged in the vain attempt of making an impossibility a possibility. At such

time as this, chemists, persons engaged in industries and petty manufacturers cannot fail to be subjected to unjust compulsion for nothing. The object desired by Government cannot be accomplished by the Explosives Act, but, on the other hand, it will serve as an instrument in the hands of the police and the petty officials to persecute good men. This effort to impose a prohibition upon the scientific knowledge about bombs and the materials (for making bombs) is vain. If bombs are to be stopped this is not the proper means (for it) ; Government should act in such a way that no turn-headed man should feel any necessity at all for throwing bombs. When do people who are engaged in political agitation become turn-headed ? It is when young (political) agitators feel keen disappointment (by being convinced) that their faculties, their strength and their self-sacrifice cannot be of any use in bringing about the welfare of their country in any other way than by acts of turn-headedness, that they become turn-headed. Government should never allow keen disappointment to take hold of the minds of those intelligent persons who have been awakened to the necessity of securing the rights of swarajya.

HISTORIC TRIAL*

The charges are rather vague. Whole articles have been included in the charges and this throws upon me the responsibility of referring to every portion of the articles likely to be pressed against me. I do not know definitely on what portions the Prosecution relies. The opening address of the Learned Counsel for the Crown contained only a few remarks. The net consequence will be that I shall have to cover wider ground and detain you longer than I meant to do. I am not a practising Barrister in this Court and it is likely that my address will not be so argumentative and close as you might expect from a Barrister practising long in this Court. I therefore request that you would show me that indulgence that is usually shown to parties pleading their own cause especially in criminal matters.

*Excerpts from Tilak's long speech in the court in his defence, July, 1908.

The case for the Prosecution manner are certain articles which have been read to you and you are asked to draw certain inferences from the wordings of those articles and by acting upon the maxim that a man intends the natural consequences of his acts return a verdict against me. A case of Sedition divides itself into three parts—(1st) There is the publication of the Article ; (2ndly) There are certain insinuations and innuendoes; and (lastly) the question of intention. The publication I have already admitted. I have taken full responsibility of the publication of those articles. I may mention that one of the points namely insinuations and innuendoes should not be based on the translations of that article. They are not the original. The original has got perverted in the translations and any insinuations based upon these translations would be likely to be unsafe. The only evidence of intention produced by the prosecution is the Card, besides the articles. They ask you to rely upon the translations of the two incriminating articles and the other three which have been produced before you to prove intention. They say you have to judge from the writing themselves whether they are seditious or not. I think the matter is not so simple as that. They question of intention is the main question in this case ; and I hope to show that by reading the articles by themselves you cannot form any judgment as to my guilt or innocence. It is unsafe, nay dangerous to adjudge me guilty merely because the words, as conceived by you from the wrong translations, are in your opinion calculated to produce feelings of hatred and contempt in a community of which probably you know nothing. It amounts to something like this : You are asked to sit in judgment on an article written in French and translated into English. You are asked to judge the effect this French article will probably produce upon the French population in England. This is a case of that kind. I shall have to refer later on to the inconvenience caused by this procedure but I want to point out that the article is written in Marathi and addressed to the Marathi-knowing population. You have to judge what effect this article is likely to produce, i e., what is the tendency of the words employed and what effect they would probably produce on the minds of the Marathi-speaking population. The *Kesari* is only read by Marathi-speaking people. It is not read all over India. You have

not to say what the effect would be in Bengal. You have to judge what effect these words would have on the minds of the readers of the *Kesari*, solely from the facts that the words complained of had a particular meaning and the sentences conveyed particular insinuation. No other fact or piece of evidence has been placed before you except the articles themselves ; and the general point upon which I shall address you when I take up the question of Law will be that this is a very unsafe method. In fact, it is not sound to rely exclusively on this one maxim, *viz.*, that a man intends the natural consequences of his own act or actions. That was the question much discussed before English Juries about a hundred years ago when there was a controversy raised in England in the time of George III before Fox's Libel Act was passed in 1792. That doctrine as embodied in the maxim is now much discredited. It is an exploded theory ; and English Juries now-a days draw their own conclusions not merely from the character of the writing itself but from all the surrounding circumstances.

The guilt of sedition is not contracted by the mere publication of language calculated to excite disaffection or disorder, for this may be done by a lunatic, or a clerk of the Court reading an indictment, or the speaking of machine. There must be a criminal mind. This state of mind is usually described by saying that the mischief for which the publication was calculated, must have been intended, because such an intention is usually the fact. But it is not meant by this, and it is certainly not necessary, that the accomplishment of that particular mischief should form the exact motive. A criminal indulgence in even a good motive will do ; as if a person should inflame the rabble from love of power, or of applause. And there may be a culpable indifference of consequences, in which absence of motive there may be as much wickedness as in the operation of motive. All these, and many other, mental conditions are states of *malus animus*. The great error to be avoided is the error of supposing that sedition can ever consist in the mere use of the language, abstracted from every other consideration. Such a principle would be inconsistent with the right of public discussion. Not that the *malus animus*, that is the wickedness, must always be established as a sub-

stantive fact by separate evidence. It may be inferred from the whole circumstances, and especially from the words, or the act or acts, charged. It is fair presumption that people mean what they say, and intend what they do. But it is competent to the accused to exclude the application of this presumption. And, consequently, since it is a matter of evidence, it is for the Jury to decide it.

This shows that the mere publication of an article, whatever the context, whatever the surrounding circumstances, is not an offence. The Jury has to make up its mind not by reading the article alone. I do not mean that it is not evidence. It is some evidence, but if I were to attribute to it a pecuniary value I would say the financial value of the article is merely one Anna in the Rupee ; you have to find 15 Annas worth of evidence elsewhere and when this is done you must look to the other circumstances. Of course, if the defence does not urge other circumstances perhaps it may be justifiable to return a verdict of guilty by reading the article alone. But, when there are other circumstances which are shown to exist, then it is the bounden duty of the Jury to take all the circumstances into consideration and then to decide whether certain intention was in the mind of the accused or not. That is what I wanted to draw your attention to in the beginning. The Section does not say whoever publishes anything likely to create disaffection ; that is not the wording of the Section. The Section says whoever 'attempts" to excite, and if that is proved you can truly say a man is guilty. If you find an ounce of opium with a man would you say that he had intended to commit suicide ? The possession of the opium would not be an indication of intention ; he may have been an habitual opium eater. If you saw a man leaping into a tank would you say it is necessarily an attempt to commit suicide ? He may be a good swimmer and may want to enjoy a plunge. Of course, it would be argued that it is for the defence to bring evidence to prove the contrary ; that the burden of it lies upon the accused. That again is wrong law and wrong doctrine. It is not sanctioned by the Evidence Act. It is the duty of the prosecution to prove everything including intention. According to the Evidence Act you have to presume first that the accused

you honestly go into the question like that, it will be your duty to give a verdict of not guilty, whatever may be your opinion about me, even if you dislike me as much as you can. I know I am not a *persona grata* with the Government ; but that is no reason why I should not have justice. My personality is not the question. The question is one of intention and that is what *you* have to decide, not his Lordship. Juries in England have returned verdicts against the directions of Judges. You might think that Government has launched this prosecution, and sometimes lower officers consider a sanction as tantamount to a mandate. I think that that view will not be taken in this case. I am sure of it ; and I am sure his Lordship will so direct you. Government for its own purposes likes certain things to be done and certain things not to be done, but the Government policy is not always justified by the principles of Law and Justice. Here it is not a question of convenience, it is not a question of expediency, but a question of justice pure and simple. If you look at the question from this standpoint then much of the misunderstanding, much of the dust that is likely to be raised by the Prosecution about this question, will be cleared up. The matter is to be looked at from one standpoint only. And that standpoint is to do justice. I ask whether in your own heart of hearts, under the circumstances, you think that you would not have written like this. If you were placed in my position and if you had been impelled by my circumstances to take up the defence of your community, what would you have done ? As I told you it is a question like that ; you must place yourselves in my position and then judge my motives and my intention. If you find by going over the whole of the incidents that my intention is pure, there is no other course open to you but to return a verdict of not guilty. I shall presently show you that the translations that are placed before you are wrong, – I will not say intentionally wrong, but I will way that they are wrong and very highly prejudicial to the Defence. I am not going to say that the translator was actuated by any bad motive. I cannnot say that ; but the result is there and it is ruinous to the Defence. Whatever the words may mean, it is a question of intention. You ought to be very careful in ascribing intention to anyone. If the results are not harmful, it is your bounden duty to suppose that th

intention is good ; even in the case where they are harmful you cannot say that the intention was necessarily bad. I will read to you from Stephen's *History of Criminal Law*, in the case of the Dean of St. Assaph. What do you find in this case ? Killing may be an offence ; it may amount to culpable homicide not amounting to murder ; or it may be caused by a rash act. If it is proved to you that a man 'A' has merely killed 'B', you cannot return a verdict of murder. Mere killing is not murder and merely taking away a purse is not theft. The circumstances under which the man takes away the purse are materially relevant or necessary to be taken into consideration. It is the duty of the Jury not to infer intention merely from the taking of the purse. The Jury must know that he took it with a wicked intention. Of course, in this case no discontent or disaffection has been proved to have been caused and the procedure here is slightly different. The Penal Code has now defined all crimes ; so there is no necessity to infer wicked intention. When the Sections are named that serves the purpose. There has been no evidence placed before you that any discontent has been brought about. You have to infer it from the writting. That procedure is I think not legal nor equitable nor moral. 'The maxim that a man intends the natural consequences of his acts is usually true : but it may be used as a way of saying that because recklessness to probable consequences is morally as bad as an intention to produce these consequences, the two things ought to be called by the same name, and this is at least an approach to a legal fiction. It is one thing to write with a distinct intention to produce disturbances and another to write violently and recklessly matter likely to produce disturbance'.—(P. 360 Stephen). So the two things are not the same. Those are the words stated there. You cannot infer any intention from the writings themselves. As I said before, give it a scale value; and if the total accumulating evidence comes to sixteen annas in a rupee, convict me. The publication is only one factor in judging of criminal intention. There must be a distinct criminal intention to justify a verdict of wicked intention. So what I have said amounts to this that this intention cannot be inferred from merely the fact of publication but from surrounding circumstances ; and between these two lies the Liberty of the Press, the whole Liberty of

the Press. The Liberty of the Press is not guarded by the Section. The Law says always infer intention from the publication, but then there would be no liberty. Liberty means that you must take all the circumstances into consideration. It is upon you that the Liberty of the Press depends.

An opinion must be represented in an independent spirit if it has to have any value. Now place yourselves in my position. Bomb-outrages take place at the beginning of the twentieth century in Bengal. I represent a large portion of the community in my paper ; Khudiram Bose has just been sentenced; and I have to express myself on the subject ; that is my duty, whether the times are excited or peaceful ; and if the times are times of unrest, it becomes the duty of a newspaperman to impress upon Government the causes of that unrest It is a very hard duty—a very thankless duty and sometimes a very risky duty. I understand it very well, but it has to be done. If the newspaper is to go on for the benefit of the people and the interest of the Government, you cannot allow any other consideration to interfere with your duty. We have not started these papers to earn money only. We have started them to discuss current topics and public questions and for creating public opinion in the country. Whether what we say be palatable or unpalatable to the people, or palatable or unpalatable to the Government, we have to make up our judgment on the spur of the moment. If the incident takes place today and my paper is published tomorrow I am bound to give my view upon it tomorrow. Perhaps it may not be correct. Man is liable to err, especially the man who writes on the spur of the moment. There are party papers that take a different view of the same matter and people learn to find out which view of the case is right. It is said that this can only be done by public discussion and agitation ; well, that is exactly what the newspaper writer has to do, I suppose. These articles were written in the performance of that duty and not for the purpose of exciting disaffection against Government. That is my point ; and if I write in the discharge of my public duty, you cannot say that the articles contain here and there expressions which in peculiar circumstances might be considered as likely to give rise to disaffection. Stating the case and writing one's views on a political question

of the day is very different from sedition; a critic may find fault with you; but to question the writer's motive is extremely ungenerous. I am not infallible; man is liable to err; but to drag me out for sedition and for punishment for malicious attempt is Gentlemen, to say the least, ungenerous—exceedingly cruel; you might or might not have experience of my position and it is for this purpose that I have to create around my articles, by reading certain extracts from other papers, the atmosphere in which I worked at the time I wrote those articles. It is quite necessary for you to realise my position at the time and see for yourself what was the atmosphere created around me and what you would have done under the circumstances. That is the proper way of judging the motives of a man, and the intention of a man; and the several papers that I have put in are papers which were lying before me at the time when those articles were written and each of them contains arguments to which I had to reply at that time. In a homogeneous country like England, there are parties like Conservatives, Liberals, Radicals and Nationalists; each man takes his own view of public events. Take, for instance, the Boer War; there were people who disapproved of it, though they were a very small minority. The majority of the nation was determined upon going to war, and the war did take place. Those who represented the view of the minority used arguments in favour of the Boers, they were called the pro-Boer party; the others used arguments against the Boers. So there was public opinion discussed on both sides and from both points of view. That is the beauty of a free press, which allows discussion in this way to the people of the country upon a particular subject. Now to come to the point, if the deplorable incident at Muzzaffarpur had happened in England the people would have been able to discuss their views freely. There was no difference of opinion here as to the character of that deplorable event but the question for Government to decide was how to prevent a recurrence? What was the cause of it? This was a question which was perfectly legitimate as a subject for discussion. Something very extraordinary takes place; something that appeals to you as quite out of the way and public disussion is sure to take place. You must realise what my position was and I am going to prove that position by reading to you extracts from Ango-Indian

newspapers of the time at which I was writing. Of course, his Lordship has ruled that if we put in certain papers we shall lose the right of reply. I do not care for the right of reply, I care for truth. The whole history of this matter must be before us. Suppose I say something in a club before the members in a discussion at the club in which members were taking part. I make some observations. If you consider my observations without taking into consideration what was said by the other members also you are sure to carry away some wrong impression. The whole discussion must be taken into consideration. Thus, to form your opinion about this article, you must read the whole article. This is admitted by the prosecution so far, but when we try to put in the papers they object. Am I not entitled to put in a single contribution to the controversy ? I have read the views of other people and have taken part in the controversy on a certain incident ; I have had to modify my views and where I disagreed with them I have had to say so. It is for that reason that the freedom of the press is protected. When communities take part in a discussion, Anglo-Indians, Mahomedans, Hindus, and Parsees each discuss the matter in their own way. In England, in every civilized country, there are parties. In India which is divided into communities, public opinion is not represented by parties formed on principles, but parties formed more or less by different communities. Now take the Bomb incident. What was the cause of it ? English papers rang on one note that the true cause of it was the agitation carried on by journalists of different shades of opinion. The *Pioneer* wrote about the 'Cult of the Bomb'. I wrote about the 'Secret of the Bomb'. Whether my view is correct or the *Pioneer's* view is correct is not the point. Others will accept the *Pioneer's* view. When this was happening, it was my duty to write about it. I move in a community which has a particular view, and being one of them I find that by consulting them I can see what my community itself thinks of it. I donot say I take votes to decide that matter but I am living amongst the members of the community which I represent and am in constant touch with them and know the view they take. Necessarily, therefore, I have to express the view of my community upon this important question of the day. If I donot express my view in my own

Journal I do not know why I should continue to be the Editor and Proprietor of a Newspaper, I shall have to give up my post and make room for others. That being the case, while there are different views formed as to the cause of this regrettable incident, I have called it 'A Misfortune of the Country'. It is the heading of my article. It is not that I am now asked for an opinion about the regrettable incident, but I have said it is the very hinge of my article on this great misfortune. Now this misfortune having occurred we were faced with two different kinds of views. One view was that it was due to political agitation, from the Congress downwards or upwards. The argument was something like this. The leaders of the Congress expressed their own opinion merely, and the Congress was not a legislative assembly. On the other side, it is stated more strongly that the nationalist party is to blame. An attempt was made to show that the bombs were the latest outcome of the agitation of these people ; and they said, 'Well, if that is the cause, put a stop to the Congress and everything of the kind. This would no longer be tolerated.' That was the view put forward by the *Pioneer*, the *Englishmen*, the *Times of India*, and even by the London *Times*. I need not name the other papers. That was one view of the case. That was the chain of the reason ing ; and what was the Government to do ? Why to put a stop to everything with a high-hand. Now I ask you, Gentlemen of the Jury, if you were the representatives of your community as I am of mine, what would you have done ? Evidently, you would have done what I did. The learned Advocate-General said that if you put anything frankly, that is no offence. It was no offence to show that the following was the view of my community. My view was the view of the Marathi speaking people and of the Hindoos everywhere. You charge me with exciting public feeling. If I show you that I did not excite the people but only expressed public opinion and simply stated the public feeling and put that down in writing for the purpose of replying to the arguments on the other side and for the information of the Government, how can you hold me to be guilty of sedition ? It is but my duty. Secondly, I am expressing public opinion and putting forward new ideas which may not be approved of by every community or which are peculiar to this province. This is my defence and you have to judge my

defence from that point of view. Our view evidently is that the *Pioneer* was referring only to a certain number of the links of the chain. What is the Congress agitation really for ? For the reform of the bureaucracy ! I follow the line of argument of the *Pioneer*. I say you only discuss some rungs of the ladder. I say that there is a hidden rung which I bring to the public view. There is an old story ; something like this. Ten men were sitting round a table ; each one was asked 'how many are you here' ? Each man replied 'nine', forgetting to count himself. This case is something like that. The bureaucracy forgets to count itself with the rest, putting it very benevolently here. That is the view on one side. What is the view on the other ? It is this ; we do accept your chain of reasoning and go a little further on, we find that the constitution of the Congress is due to certain defects in the bureaucracy. It you want to stop bombs now it will not do to put down the Congress agitation ; but you ought to put down the bureaucracy first or reform it. I know that some of you may not like this. That does not matter. I have not come here with the object of forcing my view upon you. The solution of the question ultimately rests with Government. Government may take one view or the other or favour one view or favour the other. The Judge has to decide in a different manner altogether. I know that when bureaucracy is not taken to task they like it ; and when we take them to task they do not like it. But we are perfectly justified in putting forward our view ; and when we do it we are charged with the crime of setting one community against another. We find certain liberty enjoyed by Anglo-Indians in India, whether officials or not ; we are entitled to enjoy the same amount of liberty. Administration would be impossible but for this freedom of expression. We have every right to place our views before the Government and also the views of our community. Every Indian journalist tries to put forward his view before the Government both as regards the cause and the preventive measures to be adopted. I have given my view regarding the causes and will go on now to the preventive measures. The controversy is still going on and it is not yet ended. So these articles written from week to week have been written upon materials, as those materials were accumulated every week. For the first week we have a certain number

of papers before us. A fortnight after we get English opinion ; we answer it from our own point of view and it becomes another contribution to the controversy. For a week or two we discuss the Indian opinion, after that we discuss the English opinion ; then a week after new newspapers come to hand with new materials for discussion, we have to express our opinion upon it ; as a matter of fact every week something happens : somebody expresses his opinion either in the form of a letter addressed to the newspaper or in an editorial. All this occurs and it becomes a journalist's duty to represent the views of the community and to write whether he agrees with them or not. It is not a matter of choice, but of duty, and if a matter of duty, I ask you, Gentlemen, what could you have done under the circumstances ? Would you not have taken the current topic or would you have been content with thinking that as the times were disturbed, you should write on a religious subject or take up an antiquarian subject and write on the latest researches ? I could not have done it. It is for the discussion of current subjects that newspapers are started and so long as I am independent and reply to the views of others I am perfectly justified in taking my views, from the standpoint which appears to me to be most efficacious. There is no question about it ; and this is the point of view from which these articles have to be considered ; and not only with the help of the maxim that everyman intends the natural consequences of his acts. The prosecution ought to have put all these matters before you and not left it for the defence to do that.

It was, as a newspaper editor, my duty to place my view before the Government in a different light from that in which the Anglo-Indian papers thought it fit to do. Gentlemen, here I must say one thing. Although I speak of the Anglo-Indian community, it is not a matter between Anglo-Indians and Indians. Political parties take the form of rival interests between communities in India. But that is not always the case ; and in my controversy I should rather say instead of Anglo-Indian community and Native community we should say the pro-bureaucracy party and the anti-bureaucracy party ; or if you do not want to use the word 'anti-bureaucracy', let us say the pro-Congress party. These were the two parties, if properly

defined. The object being to place both sides before the Government. I use the words pro-bureaucrat and 'pro-Congress' deliberately in order to show that their interests are not racial interests. It is a mistake to suppose that the controversy arose out of any racial differences. There was a real opposition of interests, such opposition as we find in England between the Conservatives and the Liberals. Of course, an attempt will be made and has been made in the newspapers to represent this conflict of interest as racial, and as due to race animosity. Our view of the matter is that it is not racial, for there are Indian gentlemen who have sided with the Anglo-Indian papers, and also that some Anglo Indians side with the native papers. One of the articles put in by the Prosecution is put in to prove intention. It is dated 19th May and is headed 'A Double Hint'. That means a 'hint' to the natives as subjects as well as to the Government. That discloses the object of an article which has been put in by the Prosecution to prove intention. 'Double Hint' is a suggestion made to Government and made to most of the native leaders who are siding with, or who are in favour of the views expressed by Anglo-Indian papers. There is a double warning conveyed to both sides ; and the warning conveyed to the people being not to go against their own interests in the hurry of the moment and not to forget what the real interests of the native community are. Because an outrage has taken place, let us not be confused but take a calm view of the situation. That is the purpose for which that article was penned ; it was to convey a hint and warning to both sides and to Government. Another point to be considered is that proposals were then actually before Government, notice had been given that Government were going to pass a Press Act and an Explosives Act. (What they passed is not exactly a Press Act.) These two measures were known to be before the Government and my comments on these measures and the view of the community on these measures had to be communicated to Government and that has been done in the other two articles. Repressive measures were contemplated ; and we had to give our views, just as it is perfectly legal for a man to give details of a bill, (in this case there was no publication as the time was too short) and to give his views on them either privately or publicly according to his position. So I had as a

newpaperman to comment on the measures contemplated, and that is done with the purpose, with the object of communicating my honest views to Government. Though Government may not agree with my views altogether I am perfectly within my right in communicating my views to Government. When I have notice of a certain measure being contemplated, it is my duty to place my views before Government. So the situation is this. As against the legal maxim that a man intends the natural consequences of his acts, you have to take into consideration all the circumstances. I have summarised them shortly : (*i*) It is a reply to Anglo-Indian criticism. (*ii*) It is a suggestion to Government and addressed to Government. (*iii*) The articles are also addressed to the people. (*iv*) It is a discussion of the situation. (*v*) It contains a warning to both parties which it is my duty as a journalist to convey, and (*vi*) It contains a criticism of the contemplated measures of Government. That is my defence, and it is on these grounds that I ask you not to rely solely upon the legal fiction but to take into consideration the other circums'ances. If you find, as I have said, that perhaps writing on the spur of the moment, it was not possible for me to weigh my words in a balance, and if you find my motive has been good, I expect acquittal from you. It is impossible in writing on the spur of the moment to make a choice of words. I must give the word at once and express my opinions. Week by week, we have to see what material gathers during the week and we have to give a summary of the public opinion ; we have both to reply and to give our views on the same. That is what has to be done at short notice in a newspaper office. The pressure is greater in the case of a daily ; it is not so great in the case of a weekly. But after all it is pressure under which we have to work. Now we work under that pressure, with the object of presenting our side before the people and the Government and replying to criticism in the press owned and controlled by the other party. That is really the situation. Place yourself in that situation and when you have done so say, if you had been an editor of a journal in these times, what you would have done ? Possibly you are not aware of the volume of matter that comes before us. In my own office I get as many as two hundred newspapers a week. We have to sift, and summarise, and settle on lines of reply. In

order to give you some idea of the pressure under which I have to work, I have put in those documents. I do not want to read them all to you. I do not wish to take up your time. In fact, I can myself ill-bear the strain in the present state of my health. All I want to do is to give you some idea of the pressure under which we have to work and of the surrounding circumstances which influence our judgment for the week. That is done in every newspaper office. Now you will kindly give your attention to one of the comments which is to the effect that the arguments of the Anglo-Indian papers are 'silly'. Here are two notes, one relates to cause and the other to preventive measures. There are the two main points. Now on these two points the controversy was raised. One party diagnosed it in one way and the other in another way, and one party treated it in one way and another party in another way. You cannot form a judgment from one article taken singly isolated from the controversy. The diagnosis of one party was political agitation. There is a party in this country which feels that the Administration is not all right. I am not asking you to agree with me. This is not a Political Club where we intend to argue with each other. This is a Court of Law where we have to see whether we have a right to put forth our views or not. It is impossible to make conversions here and I am not going to attempt it. I only say that every party has the right of expressing opinion in its own way and the same right must be conceded to the other party. Now that is the purpose for which these papers have been put in. If the other side had aid that the arguments of this side are dangerous or preposterous I would have been perpectly justified in saying that they are talking nonsense. It is in that way you have to judge the import of the words used by me in this controversy. It is a reply. It is as it were a tug of war and the tension on the rope can only be asertained by ascertaining the force on each side. It cannot be done otherwise. The Prosecution have only placed before you one end of the rope in this tug of war. It is a rule in mathematics that no tension can be created by pulling a string at one end only. When you want to find a tension you have to see what the forces are at both ends. It is not a question of who is right and who is wrong. If both parties are entitled to put forth their views, I request you to show the same consideration

from the point of view of law and justice to both parties. If it were a controversy taking place in England between two parties one party would say that the other party had no right to be in power. Now the Liberals are in power, and the Conservatives say that they ought not to be in power. There is a controversy raised about the existence of the House of Lords itself. Do you mean to say that the controversy raised about the House of Lords is seditious ? Then the late Prime Minister would have to be sent to jail for his speech against the House of Lords. He was not questioned at all as he was entitled to express his opinions. As I have said Government in the concrete should be distinguished from Government in the abstract. I am not here to advocate that my view is right. Some people think that the present state of things is all right, others think that it should be reformed. But in any case each party should have the liberty to place its views before Government. What is the advantage of a free Press ? It has its disadvantages, but on the whole, advantages outweigh the disadvantages. India is fortunately ruled by a civilized nation. The liberty of a free Press is allowed to us. I know we have not had to fight for it, as the English people had to do in 1792 ; but after all it is a concession granted to us and so long as it is not withdrawn we are entitled to have the same liberty that is enjoyed in England. Now with these remarks I propose to read to you the first charge-article. It is the article which appeared in the *Kesari* dated 12th May. It deals with the events of the 29th and 30th of April. Of course views on these events were published in the issue of 5th May, 1908. When our views in the article were written we wanted to see what shape the controversy would take. In the meanwhile, as an editor, I had on my table a number of notes. What I do with these notes is this. I read them. I digest them and I give a summary of the news in my paper and at the same time if I think there is anything harmful to the interests of my community I try to reply. Now the reply must not be judged in the cool atmosphere of this room but taking into consideration the state of which my mind was brought on reading these notes. You must feel as I felt then, and it can only be done by placing before you the matters which were before me when I wrote these articles. This is the relevancy of the various papers that have been put in. Very

likely you may be taking one or two of these papers but you may have no idea of what the controversy is, and it is to give you that idea that I put in these papers. You must be reading some of these newspapers but not all. What do the editors do? They do the work for you. But here you are brought to give a judgment, and I read these papers to you in order that you should arrive at a sound decision. Now the papers I have put in may be classified under three or four heads. You have the comments made by the English papers such as the *Pioneer*, the *Englishman*, the *Stateman*, the *Empire*, the *Times of India*, the *Advocate of India*. Then you havs the reply of the Indian Press to the same in the *Bengalee*, the *Hindu*, the *Madras Standard*, the *Patrika*, the *Punjabi*, etc. It is not only in the Marathi Journals that the controversy is raised. It is raised all over India. The two views are represented by the exponents of the different parties in the press over which they had control or which represented them. That is the point to which I shall draw your attention. So you have first of all the opinion of the English papers in India and then the opinion of the native press in India. Then came after a fortnight home papers with the views on this incident of Englishmen. That becomes another chapter on this controversy. When I read to you the three or four articles which have been put in you will find that they have not been written for nothing, but that there was an immediate cause which prompted the writing of these articles. This is the way we write from week to week. It was one of the arguments of the learned Counsel for the Crown that I had been going on from week to week issuing seditious articles. But the controversy went on from week to week. You have the English opinion, the Anglo-Indian opinion, and the Native Press opinion, and then we come to the view held in this Presidency and by the Marathi-speaking population. I am charged specifically with causing excitement not throughout India but among the Marathi-speaking population. I do not stand alone in my views. I put a question to Mr. Joshi as to how many parties there are among the Marathi-speaking people as I wanted to show that the papers of all parties to which the writers belong and of all parties in the Marathi-speaking community took the same views as I did. That absolves me from an evil intention. If there is no personal prejudice against me

these articles will show that I was not prompted by any personal prejudices.

(Referring to the famous post card Tilak, said :)

Of course, the insinuation to be drawn from the card is that I was engaged in manufacturing bombs or some explosives, and that is the reason why the names of these books appear in the card ! It was found along with some other papers in the search in the unlocked drawer of his writing table, a drawer which was not locked up. It was found with other papers. I have put in those papers in order that you may judge of the character of the other papers that were found along with it and the purpose for which it was written and to show whether they were papers of ordinary daily business or whether it was kept in some other part of the drawer. That was the reason why I questioned the Police Officer and remarked that the card was found behind my back. This card was found among daily papers of business and not in some nook and corner where it could not be discovered by any one. I have told you that after I wrote this article we wanted to criticise in detail the provisions of the Explosives Act and especially the definition of an explosive, which according to the Act, embraced even ordinary kerosene oil. It was necessary to collect materials to see whether the definition provided in the Explosives Act tallied with the categorizations in the works on explosives. The only reference book he had with him was *The Encyclopedia Britannica* and that being not exhaustive, he wanted to refer to the catalogue to see whether there was any work on explosives. There was one portion of the card scratched and the names were rewritten with the prices. Hence, the insinuation that the card contained the list of books on explosives with the intention of the writer to manufacture bombs was unjustified and unwarranted by the evidence.

(Stating the duties of the Jury, Tilak quoted from the Criminal Procedure Code, Sections 298 and 299 :)

(*a*) To decide which view of the facts is true and then to return the verdict which under such view ought, according to the direction of the Judge, to be returned ;

(*b*) to determine the meaning of all technical terms (other than terms of law) and words used in an unusual sense which it may be necessary to determine, whether such words occur in documents or not ;

(*c*) to decide all questions which according to law are to be deemed questions of fact ;

(*d*) to decide whether general indefinite expressions do or do not apply to particular cases unless such expressions refer to legal procedure or unless their meaning is ascertained by law, in either of which cases it is the duty of the Judge to decide their meaning'.

(Towards the end of the speech Tilak said :)

The question does not touch the existence of Government. The bomb outrages were quickly condemned in my paper as in the Anglo-Indian papers. We do not hold that bomb throwing is not a criminal act and is not reprehensible. We condemn it. But in condemning it we say that we must also condemn the repressive measures of Government I also explain that it is a power which can be created without requiring much preparation. There are certain powers which can be created by means of a physical act. This is nothing of the kind ; it is something like a spell and it deserves to be condemned ; but in order to repress it and get rid of it certain reforms are necessary in the administration. Both parties are taking advantage of the presence of the bomb. The Bureaucratic party is taking advantage of it to suppress political agitation and the other party is taking advantage of it to claim some reforms. I can certainly ask at your hands the same privilege in this country as is enjoyed by the English Press at home. It is very important question. It is the same question which was fought out by Erskine in the case of the Dean of St. Asaph. It is the question that was fought out in England as long ago as 1792. English people now enjoy the Liberty of the Press which they demanded and got in the 18th century. This is a similar case and all that I ask is to give it a patient hearing. I know you are placed at a certain disadvantage by not knowing Marathi ; but you have another advantage which a Marathi-knowing

Jury might not have possessed. You are proud of your traditions. You got the liberty of the Press after a long struggle and I believe that you attach more importance to that than even we do here. I can trace a great struggle between the people on the one hand and a mighty Bureaucracy on the other. And I ask you to help us, not me personally, but the whole of India in our endeavours to obtain a share in the Government of this country. The matter has come to a critical stage ; we are in want of help ; you can give it to us. I am now on the wrong side of life according to the Indian standard of life. For me it can only be a matter of a few years, but future generations will look to your verdict and see whether you have judged wrong or right. The verdict is likely to be a memorable one in the history of the struggle for the freedom of the Indian Press. You have a heavy responsibility upon you. It is, I state again and again, not a personal question. If at least one of you would come forward and say that I was right in what I did it will be a matter of satisfaction to me ; for I know that if the Jury are not unanimous in England another trial would take place. It is not so here but it would be a moral support upon which I would rely with great satisfaction. It is a question mainly of intention. You have all read the passages yourselves and you can determine the meaning of those passages and can say what the intention was. Was in it there an attempt to excite disaffection or enmity or hatred between any classes of his Majesty's Subjects ? And remember that an attempt includes intention and there cannot be an aimless attempt. When I was in school I was taught a small sentence. 'Caesar aimed at the crown but failed.' That clearly explains the word attempt. Now as I have put all the circumstances before you, you must read the writings for yourselves and decide whether those passages do intend to excite disaffection or feelings of enmity. If you could come to a unanimous verdict, well and good. If not, then do not try to come to an artificial unanimity. Even one of you saying that I was right would be a source of satisfaction to me—a kind of moral support. If you cannot come to a unanimous conclusion you will state what you think, each of you, whether the articles in question are criminal or not. You might not agree with my views. Even if you do not agree, you are entitled to say that in your opinion

the matter does not come under Section 124A. You may agree or not with me, you may accept my views or not accept my views. That is not the point at issue. The point is whether I was within my rights and whether a subject of His Majesty in India can or cannot enjoy the same freedom which is enjoyed by British subjects at Home, and the Anglo-Indians out here. That is the point at issue. It is not a matter whether the views are correct. I may, who knows, alter my views, Gentlemen, and come to your views. You will presently hear what the Advocate-General has to say and after him His Lordship will address you. The responsibility is yours ; you will have to return a verdict of guilty or not guilty. Coming from the people and knowing their sentiments and thoughts you will have to say what you think would be the effect. I would ask you to forget all other circumstances outside this court. You must be reading the daily papers and finding in some of them, I wont say an attempt but a fact, to associate my name in connection with something which is going on in this city. I wanted to bring the matter to His Lordship's notice but I thought it was a small matter. Gentlemen of the Jury, you will have to leave all that out of your consideration. I know that there are certain prejudices against me. I request you to keep aside those prejudices. Judge me on facts. One reason I undertook to defend myself was that you would know the man. I have told you, perhaps bluntly, what I have done. I have concealed nothing from you. I have stated what my object is. If you find anything wrong therein you can return a verdict against me. But I believe, nay, I am confident, you will find nothing in it against me. You wlll after taking all the circumstances into consideration return a verdict of not guilty. I appeal to you not for myself but in the interest of the cause which I have the honour to represent It is a cause that is sacred and I doubt not, Gentlemen, that He before whom all of us will have to stand one day and render an account of our actions will inspire you with the courage of your convictions and help you in arriving at a right decision on the issue involved in this case.